

83/166

c

v. 1

The Bancroft Library

University of California • Berkeley

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

Women in Politics Oral History Project

Lucile Hosmer

A CONSERVATIVE REPUBLICAN IN THE
MAINSTREAM OF PARTY POLITICS

With an Introduction by
Elsa Sandstrom

An Interview Conducted by
Malca Chall
1975-1976

b 1907

d. 1928

Underwritten by a research grant from the
Research Collection Program of the
National Endowment for the Humanities

Copyright © 1983 by the Regents of the University of California

This manuscript is made available for research purposes. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Lucile Hosmer, "A Conservative Republican in the Mainstream of Party Politics," an oral history conducted 1975-1976 by Malca.Chall, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 1983.

Copy No. 1



LUCILE HOSMER

TABLE OF CONTENTS -- Lucile Hosmer

PREFACE	i
INTRODUCTION by Elsa Sandstrom	vi
INTERVIEW HISTORY	viii
BRIEF BIOGRAPHY	xi
 I FAMILY BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION	 1
Parents and Grandparents	1
Family Interest in Politics	9
Grammar School Education at Home	14
Mother's Interest in Women's Rights	18
Father's Community Interests	23
More on Lucile Hosmer's Unique Educational Background	24
Marriages, Work, and Study	27
 II MOVING UP THE LADDER: LOCAL AND STATE POLITICS, 1946-1965	 36
The Sequoia Union High School District Board Elections, 1946	36
The California Republican Assembly, 1944	39
The San Mateo County Federation [Council] of Republican Women, 1945	41
Women's Chairman for Assemblyman Richard Dolwig, 1946	46
Appointment to the Republican State Central Committee, 1948	53
Committee to Elect Richard Nixon to the Senate, 1950	54
President, San Mateo County Federation [Council] of Republican Women, 1952-1956	57
Principle of Fairness: A Motivating Philosophy	58
The Campaign of J. Arthur Younger, 1952	64
Other Issues, 1952	71
The Structure of the California Federation of Republican Women	75
Methods of Organization	84
The Traveling Schools of Politics	87
Hearing Both Sides of an Issue	90
The State Central Committee: Selecting the Leaders	93
Women and the Role of the Federation of Republican Women	97
President, Northern Division, California Federation of Republican Women, 1957-1960	106
William Knowland and the 1958 Gubernatorial Campaign	111
 III CALIFORNIA AND THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, 1976	 125
Background, 1960	125
Background, 1964	133

The California Delegation, 1976	136
Comparing Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan	151
Joining the Unity Group	161
Party Leaders and the California Presidential Election Campaign	162
 TAPE GUIDE	 167
 APPENDIX	
History of the California Federation of Republican Women	168
Past Presidents, 1925-1976	169
Pro America	173
Letters:	
Lucile Hosmer to Rosalyn Haley, 1976	175
Ronald Reagan to Lucile Hosmer, 1976	178
Articles by Lucile Hosmer:	
"Religious Freedom in America and the Supreme Court	
Decisions," 1963	179
"Abraham Lincoln"	181
Resume prepared for lecture tour	185
Obituaries	189
Memorial Service	190
Text of remarks delivered by James B. Rose	191
In Memoriam to Lucile Hosmer by Peggy Moore	195
 INDEX	 196

PREFACE

The following interview is one of a series of tape-recorded memoirs in the California Women Political Leaders Oral History Project. The series has been designed to study the political activities of a representative group of California women who became active in politics during the years between the passage of the woman's suffrage amendment and the current feminist movement--roughly the years between 1920 and 1965. They represent a variety of views: conservative, moderate, liberal, and radical, although most of them worked within the Democratic and Republican parties. They include elected and appointed officials at national, state, and local governmental levels. For many the route to leadership was through the political party--primarily those divisions of the party reserved for women.

Regardless of the ultimate political level attained, these women have all worked in election campaigns on behalf of issues and candidates. They have raised funds, addressed envelopes, rung doorbells, watched polls, staffed offices, given speeches, planned media coverage, and when permitted, helped set policy. While they enjoyed many successes, a few also experienced defeat as candidates for public office.

Their different family and cultural backgrounds, their social attitudes, and their personalities indicate clearly that there is no typical woman political leader; their candid, first-hand observations and their insights about their experiences provide fresh source material for the social and political history of women in the past half century.

In a broader framework their memoirs provide valuable insights into the political process as a whole. The memoirists have thoughtfully discussed details of party organization and the work of the men and women who served the party. They have analysed the process of selecting party leaders and candidates, running campaigns, raising funds, and drafting party platforms, as well as the more subtle aspects of political life such as maintaining harmony and coping with fatigue, frustration, and defeat. Perceived through it all are the pleasures of friendships, struggles, and triumphs in a common cause.

The California Women Political Leaders Oral History Project has been financed by both an outright and a matching grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Matching funds were provided by the Rockefeller Foundation for the Helen Gahagan Douglas component of the project, by the Columbia and Fairtree Foundations, and by individuals who were interested in supporting memoirs of their friends and colleagues. In addition, funds from the California State Legislature-sponsored Knight-Brown Era Governmental History Project made it possible to increase the research and broaden the scope of the interviews in which there was

a meshing of the woman's political career with the topics being studied in the Knight-Brown project. Professors Judith Blake Davis, Albert Lepawsky, and Walton Bean have served as principal investigators during the period July 1975-December 1977 that the project was underway. This series is the second phase of the Women in Politics Oral History Project, the first of which dealt with the experiences of eleven women who had been leaders and rank-and-file workers in the suffrage movement.

The Regional Oral History Office was established to tape record autobiographical interviews with persons significant in the history of the West and the nation. The Office is under the administrative supervision of James D. Hart, Director of The Bancroft Library. Interviews were conducted by Amelia R. Fry, Miriam Stein, Gabrielle Morris, Malca Chall, Fern Ingersoll, and Ingrid Scobie.

Malca Chall, Project Director
Women in Politics Oral History Project

Willa Baum, Department Head
Regional Oral History Office

15 November 1979
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California at Berkeley

CALIFORNIA WOMEN POLITICAL LEADERS ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

- Frances Mary Albrier, *Determined Advocate for Racial Equality*. 1979, 308 p.
- Marjorie Benedict, *Developing a Place for Women in the Republican Party*. In process.
- Odessa Cox, *Challenging the Status Quo: The Twenty-seven Year Campaign for Southwest Junior College*. 1979, 149 p.
- Pauline Davis, *California Assemblywoman, 1952-1976*. In process.
- Ann Eliaser, *From Grassroots Politics to the Top Dollar: Fundraising for Candidates and Non-profit Agencies*. 1983, 306 p.
- March Fong Eu, *High Achieving Nonconformist in Local and State Government*. 1977, 245 p.
- Jean Wood Fuller, *Organizing Women: Careers in Volunteer Politics and Government Administration*. 1977, 270 p.
- Elizabeth Rudel Gatov, *Grassroots Party Organizer to Treasurer of the United States*. 1978, 412 p.
- Elinor Heller. In process.
- Patricia Hitt, *From Precinct Worker to Assistant Secretary of HEW*. 1980, 220 p.
- Lucile Hosmer, *A Conservative Republican in the Mainstream of Party Politics*. 1983, 200 p.
- Kimiko Fujii Kitayama, *Nisei Leader in Democratic Politics and Civic Affairs*. 1979, 110 p.
- Bernice Hubbard May, *A Native Daughter's Leadership in Public Affairs*. Two volumes, 1976, 540 p.
- LaRue McCormick, *Activist in the Radical Movement, 1930-1960: The International Labor Defense and the Communist Party*. 1980, 166 p.
- Hulda Hoover McLean, *A Conservative's Crusades for Good Government*. 1977, 174 p.
- Emily Pike, *Republican Party Campaign Organizer: From Volunteer to Professional*. 1983, 389 p.
- Julia Porter, *Dedicated Democrat and City Planner, 1941-1975*. 1977, 195 p.
- Wanda Sankary, *From Sod House to State House*. 1979, 109 p.
- Hope Mendoza Schechter, *Activist in the Labor Movement, the Democratic Party, and the Mexican-American Community*. 1980, 165 p.
- Vera Schultz, *Ideals and Realities in State and Local Government*. 1977, 272 p.

- Clara Shirpser, *One Woman's Role in Democratic Party Politics: National, State, and Local, 1950-1973*. Two volumes, 1975, 671 p.
- Elizabeth Snyder, *California's First Woman State Party Chairman*. 1977, 199 p.
- Eleanor Wagner, *Independent Political Coalitions: Electoral, Legislative, and Community*. 1977, 166 p.
- Carmen Warschaw, *A Southern California Perspective on Democratic Party Politics*. 1983 (edited transcript in The Bancroft Library), 450 p.
- Carolyn Wolfe, *Educating for Citizenship: A Career in Community Affairs and the Democratic Party, 1906-1976*. 1978, 254 p.
- Rosalind Wyman, *"It's a Girl:" Three Terms on the Los Angeles City Council, 1953-1965; Three Decades in the Democratic Party, 1948-1979*. 1979, 150 p.
- Mildred Younger, *Inside and Outside Government and Politics, 1929-1980*. 1983, 353 p.

The Helen Gahagan Douglas Component of the California Women Political Leaders
Oral History Project

Volume I: *The Political Campaigns*

Discussion primarily of the 1950 Senate campaign and defeat, in interviews with Tilford E. Dudley, India T. Edwards, Leo Goodman, Kenneth R. Harding, Judge Byron F. Lindsley, Helen Lustig, Alvin P. Meyers, Frank Rogers, and William Malone.*

Volume II: *The Congress Years, 1944-1950*

Discussion of organization and staffing; legislation on migrant labor, land, power and water, civilian control of atomic energy, foreign policy, the United Nations, social welfare, and economics, in interviews with Juanita E. Barbee, Rachel S. Bell, Albert S. Cahn, Margery Cahn, Evelyn Chavoor, Lucy Kramer Cohen, Arthur Goldschmidt, Elizabeth Wickenden Goldschmidt, Chester E. Holifield, Charles Hogan, Mary Keyserling, and Philip J. Noel-Baker.

Volume III: *Family, Friends, and the Theater: The Years Before and After Politics*

Discussion of Helen and Melvyn Douglas and their activities at home with their family and among friends, and their work in the theater and movies, in interviews with Fay Bennett, Alis De Sola, Cornelia C. Palms, and Walter R. Pick.

Volume IV: *Congresswoman, Actress, and Opera Singer*

Helen Gahagan Douglas discusses her background and childhood; Barnard College education; Broadway, theater and opera years; early political organization and Democratic party work; the congressional campaigns, supporters; home and office in Washington; issues during the Congress years, 1944-1950; the 1950 Senate campaign against Richard M. Nixon, and aftermath; women and independence; occupations since 1950; speaking engagements, travel to Russia, South America, Liberia inauguration, civic activities, life in Vermont.

*William Malone preferred not to release his transcript at this time.

INTRODUCTION

Lucile Hosmer, wife, mother, modern day patriot; loved, admired, honored! She gave fully of her heart, her energies and personal commitment to her family and to all of her activities. "One Nation Under God, with liberty and justice for all"...our freedoms must be preserved...were her watchwords. To her, working in the political arena was a way to serve the country she loved. The principles set forth in the Constitution and Bill of Rights were the rock on which this nation must stand; her voice became a clarion call to all who would listen to be aware of the insidious, quiet and slow erosion over the years threatening the foundation so carefully set down for future generations by the Founding Fathers.

Lucile Hosmer loved a challenge, especially if an issue dared to dispute her view. No stand was taken lightly, and her writings and speeches, carefully researched, had to stand the test of principle. Her audiences listened to her as an authority, were enlightened, and carried the "ammunition" back to their own bailiwicks. So highly respected and admired was she, it would be difficult to calculate the number of both men and women she inspired to contribute of themselves to political campaigns and speak up for America.

I decided to enter volunteer politics more extensively after leaving full-time employment in 1958. Politics had always been an interest and part-time avocation of both my husband and myself and without the full-time position, I could give more time. So, I joined the California Federation of Republican Women and shortly thereafter was privileged to meet and get to know Lucile Hosmer. Our many common interests and easy communication produced a deep and lasting friendship. As my very dear friend, she is unbelievably missed, and would that I could do justice to her memory.

We traveled together frequently along the political trails, and the many hours together on the highways provided time for exchanges of ideas and personal thoughts on many subjects.

The Bible was her political textbook; we shared a mutual love for its precepts. The eagle was her "talismán." A favorite Bible verse of hers was:

"But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint." (Isa. 40:31)

After retiring from the Parole Board, it was her intention to devote more time to political activities and lectures. She was looking forward to once again being out there in the hustings doing her share, and more. With

the tremendous background of experience and the respect and admiration she commanded, her passing is a great loss to the political world.

Had the present rising acceptance of women in political office been present during her active period, it is not inconceivable that she could have been prevailed upon to run for office. She would have made an ideal candidate. Always firm in her convictions and strong in the support of any cause she chose to embrace, she knew as well it was the better part of wisdom to avoid abrasiveness in controversy, and to heed the admonishment of the Bible:

"...be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." (Mat. 10:16)

Lucile Hosmer understood the techniques of politics and her endorsement of any candidate carried great weight. Not averse to turning a candidate down, fortunate was the candidate who received her backing.

Having made herself an influence for good in California politics, she enjoyed friendly communication with legislators, congressmen, senators, the governor, and numerous top political figures. They valued her opinions on issues and sought her support for their views.

The passing on of my friend, Lucile Hosmer, left an irreplaceable void in my life; yet her memory lives on. Even now, when I attend political events in California, her name invariably crops up in conversations. She will always be remembered for the example she set by her dedication to principle, and her many, many contributions of energy and time to political campaigns.

Lucile Hosmer was truly a woman who made an impact in California politics that will live forever in the memories of those who knew her and loved her.

Elsa Sandstrom

10 October 1980
Oceanside, California

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Lucile Hosmer, a long time active leader in the conservative wing of the Republican party, came to the attention of the California Political Leaders Oral History Project when her fellow Republican Joseph Shell, during his own interview, mentioned that he had admired her greatly for her organizational skills and her help in his primary campaign for governor against Richard Nixon in 1962.

Though Lucile Hosmer worked much of the time within the mainstream of Republican politics at county and state levels and in her official capacities with the California Federation of Republican Women, her political philosophy and the candidates and issues she preferred to espouse were always closer to the party's conservative wing than to its center. Gradually as the conservatives settled into the party's mainstream Lucile Hosmer was found donating her energies to Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan and attending national conventions in their delegations. She said that she believed in being conservative, "but you have to have common sense and good judgment in connection with it. When you go off the deep end you lose your influence and your ability to convince anybody of anything."

When she began this oral history in mid-1975 she was active in Pro America and the Christian Schools movement, and was completing her term as a Reagan-appointed member of the Women's Board of Terms and Parole. In addition she was winding up several busy years on the San Mateo County Bicentennial Commission, and laying plans for going on the lecture circuit to talk on the many subjects about which she had been writing and lecturing during the past twenty years or more.

Despite her heavily committed schedule and the fact that the parole board required that she be away from home several days each month, Mrs. Hosmer agreed to set aside time for the planned eight to ten two-hour interview sessions. She understood that she would be providing a different point of view than most of the women who had been selected for the California Women Political Leaders project and she was pleased that she had been asked to participate.

Some months prior to the first taping session, we met in her home for lunch so that she could become acquainted with me as well as with the general outline of topics which might be selected for the forthcoming recording sessions. Her home was in a large, comfortable apartment in the Belmont hills. The spacious living room with its small adjoining dining alcove provided a perfect setting for her extraordinary museum-quality collection of Americana--antique furniture, clocks and other accessories, books, and paintings, among which was a medium-sized "Washington Rallying the Troops at Monmouth" by

Samuel Leutze which hung in the dining room. All of these furnishings, largely inherited, demonstrated Mrs. Hosmer's deep roots and pride in her American heritage. As we ate lunch on the large screened porch off the living room, she enjoyed my obvious surprise that cups, saucers, spoons, and napkins all bore witness to America's history. Some of them had been in the Hosmer cupboards many years prior to the bicentennial celebration.

Although she held strong opinions--or to state it another way, she held opinions strongly--it was clear from the start of our collaboration that she was not stuffy, nor did she match the popular image of the stern, unyielding, uncompromising patriot without sense of humor or compassion. She was warm and friendly, had a hearty laugh, and could laugh at herself as well as at the foibles of some of her fellows in the body politic. It is likely that those who knew Lucile Hosmer as a friend may have seen her differently from those with whom she did battle on issues.

Not having much time to sort through her large collection of papers stashed away in boxes and trunks, she could offer me only a limited amount of material to assist my research into her background in preparation for the interviews. However, information from other sources was at hand. Naomi Youngduff, librarian at the San Mateo Times and an old friend of Mrs. Hosmer, gave me access to the files from the years 1948-1975 and kindly cleared space at a small table in the crowded library so that I could work comfortably during the several days I studied the press clippings. The late James Halley, prominent San Francisco attorney and for many years a leader in local and statewide Republican party affairs, talked to me late one afternoon in his office. I learned much from him about Republican politics and his assessment of Lucile Hosmer and many other women activists. By phone, Frank Ingersoll, one-time chairman of the San Mateo County Republican Central Committee, looked back on his association with Lucile Hosmer. Finally, Barbara Stidham, then president (1975-1977) of the Northern Division, California Federation of Republican Women, came to the Regional Oral History Office and provided some invaluable background about the federation, its leaders and some of the issues which had divided the organization. This was important because Mrs. Hosmer and most of the Republican women who would be interviewed in this series had been at one time or another associated with the Federation of Republican Women.

There was general agreement that although Lucile Hosmer represented what was considered the party's right wing by most of these Republicans with whom she had been allied, they valued her efforts as an organizer, as a leader who could get others to work with her, and because she understood that, despite differences in philosophy, team effort was necessary for success in elections.

The first of the five interview sessions took place September 10, 1975, and was followed by four others on December 10, 1975, August 6, September 14, and December 5, 1976. Mrs. Hosmer was often recovering from illness at the

time of the interviews--with flu, with a painful back--but she kept her appointments because the interviews had been difficult to schedule. Even at the time of her last interview she was quite ill with what she had diagnosed as food poisoning, but what was in fact the result of a series of small strokes.

The interviews had been designed to follow a chronological outline in order to understand Lucile Hosmer's background, her motivations, and her activities within and outside of the political arena. Mrs. Hosmer had the outlines to help her review prior to each session. Only once did we depart from the chronology, and that for a compelling reason. It was September 14, 1976 and Mrs. Hosmer had just returned from the Republican National Convention at which then-President Gerald Ford instead of Ronald Reagan had been selected as the party's presidential nominee. Television and the press had scrutinized that convention with seemingly microscopic attention. But what had it been like to one who had been there as a Reagan delegate and had tasted the bitter dregs of disappointment? While it was still a fresh and painful memory was the time to capture the story on tape. And so we did.

What turned out to be our final interview session lasted barely thirty minutes. Mrs. Hosmer felt too ill to continue longer. Shortly thereafter she suffered a massive disabling stroke from which she never fully recovered. She died in March 1978. After the memorial service, many friends went to Mrs. Hosmer's apartment, then occupied by her son William, where a few close friends had organized a lovely reception. In a corner of the room Bill had pulled together some representative memorabilia from his mother's papers to give an indication of the range of her activities during her active seventy-one years. Eventually, it is hoped that these papers will be deposited in The Bancroft Library.

Lucile Hosmer's untimely death, of course, is understood to be a great loss to her son and her many close friends. One of them, Elsa Sandstrom, has written a moving introduction to this volume. But her death must also be seen as a real loss to history. For vital stages in her life related to the major social issues of the state and nation were never covered; her association with Phyllis Schlafley and the Eagle Forum and her opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment; her commitment to the Christian School movement; her roles in the Goldwater and Nixon campaigns; her two terms on the Women's Board of Prisons and Parole which her son told me had affected her deeply. Mrs. Hosmer's death also made it difficult to check the accuracy of some of the information in the interviews. Uncertainty about dates, spelling, or other data have been indicated by [?].

This fragment of the life of one unique woman and political leader will now take its place among the many histories of women being studied throughout the United States. We are pleased to have it among the California women political leaders.

Malca Chall
Interviewer-Editor

8 December 1982
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California at Berkeley

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY -- Lucile Hosmer

- 1907 Born, San Francisco, California, August 15
- 1912-1924 Receives grammar school education at home; Girls High, Galileo High School, San Francisco
- 1924-1926 Attends San Mateo Junior College; summer sessions University of California, Berkeley
- 1936-1941 Assistant buyer, Hales Department Store, San Francisco, California
- 1942- Married to Merritt Hosmer; moved to San Carlos, California
- 1944- Member San Mateo County Republican Assembly
- 1945-1967 San Mateo County Federation of Republican Women; 1946, Secretary; 1947, Program Chairman; 1948, County Campaign Chairman; 1948-1952, Vice-President; 1952-1956, President.
- 1946, 1948, 1950 San Mateo County Women's Chairman for Assemblyman Richard J. Dolwig
- 1948-1976 Appointed member, Republican State Central Committee
- 1950 Member San Mateo County Committee for election of Richard Nixon for United States Senator
- 1952-1966;
1967-1968 San Mateo County Precinct Chairman
- 1952, 1956 San Mateo County Women's Chairman for Eisenhower-Nixon
- 1953-1974 Appointed to San Mateo County Republican Central Committee, elected first Vice-Chairman; reelected, 1954-1974.
- 1954-1967 California Federation of Republican Women,
--1954-1956, Americanism Chairman, Northern Division;
--1956-1958, 1958-1960, President, Northern Division,
establishes traveling schools of politics in the north;
--1958-1960, State Americanism Chairman;
--1960-1963, State President;
--1963-1967, member, State Board.

- 1958 Northern California Women's Chairman for William F. Knowland for Governor
- 1960-1967 Member, Executive Board of National Federation of Republican Women;
 --1960-1963, as State President of California;
 --1963-1965, as National Americanism Chairman;
 --1965-1967, as National Legislation Chairman
- 1960 Member, Northern California Committee for Richard Nixon for President
- 1960 Delegate to Republican National Convention; Secretary to California Delegation
- 1960 Elector, Electoral College in California
- 1962 Member, Northern California Committee for Richard Nixon for Governor
- 1962 Member, Committee to elect Dr. Max Rafferty State Superintendent of Public Instruction (primary election)
- 1964 Liaison to California from National Women's Committee to elect Goldwater-Miller
- 1964 Delegate to Republican National Convention
- 1966 State Women's Chairman for reelection of Dr. Max Rafferty (primary election)
- 1966 San Mateo County Co-Chairman for Ronald Reagan for Governor (general election); Northern California Executive Committee for Reagan for Governor
- 1968 Delegate to Republican National Convention
- 1969-1974 Third National Vice-President, Pro America
- 1968-1976 Appointed member, California State Women's Board of Terms and Parole
- 1976 President, Pro America, Northern California chapter
- 1976 Delegate to Republican National Convention; Chairman, American Heritage '76 Committee of the San Mateo County American Revolution Bicentennial Commission
- 1978 Lucile Hosmer dies, March 2

I, FAMILY BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION

[Interview 1: September 10, 1975]##

Parents and Grandparents

Chall: What I'd like to do today is to start with your background. So first tell me where and when you were born and then we'll go into your family.

Hosmer: I was born in San Francisco, on Sixth Avenue between California and Clement Streets--was born at home.

Chall: At home: That was the way it was done in those days?

Hosmer: Well, the doctor came to the home and was supposed to register my birth but she never did it. And I had an awful time proving I had been born.

Chall: Oh yes, when you want your social security.

Hosmer: So, that's where I was born.

Chall: About 1910?

Hosmer: 1907. I'm a little older than you think. [laughter]

Chall: What can you tell me about your parents and your grandparents? You can start with your mother's family.

Hosmer: My mother was born in Lake County at Bartlett Springs.

Chall: And what was her name?

##This symbol indicates that a tape or a segment of a tape has begun or ended. For a guide to the tapes see page 167.

Hosmer: Lucy Ellen Younger Helm. They dropped the Younger when he got mixed up with the James boys. That was a cousin of my grandmother from what I understand. I've never verified that either. So she was known as Lucy Ellen Helm. When she was about twelve, they moved to Washington, the state of Washington, and my mother didn't like it because it was so rainy and cold up there. So she took her baby sister who was about six and started back to California on a horse. [laughs]

Chall: And how old was she then?

Hosmer: She was twelve. She was twelve at the time and her baby sister was six years old, and she didn't want to go off and leave her behind so she put her on the horse with her. Of course there were Indians and bears and everything else under the sun at that time.

Chall: When was your mother born, do you have her birth date?

Hosmer: 1869. She and my father were both teachers, and Mother was close to forty when she and my dad were married. [1902] Then my brother was born and I was born three years later, so I guess she was about forty-three. They told her she couldn't have any children but she did.

Chall: Well, tell me more about your mother. She looks like a determined person from her pictures and she must have been from what you've told me already.

Hosmer: She was very much of a perfectionist, a very brilliant person. She started teaching, up in Washington.

Chall: So she never really got back to California at the age of twelve.

Hosmer: No she never did. They caught up with her and took her back to Washington.

Chall: What part of Washington was this? What city?

Hosmer: Oh heavens. I have known. I can't think of it at the moment.

Chall: Okay. I just wondered where she started her teaching.

Hosmer: Of course, you know how they took examinations. I thought maybe there'd be something in here about it [shuffling of papers]. What they did, of course--they took the school exams and they taught for a year and then they took the county exams. She did that for years. Her father had died of a heart attack so Mother was really responsible for the care of the family; that was younger members of the family.

Chall: How many were there?

Hosmer: You should have given me a chance to check that. [laughter]

Chall: That's all right, you can put it in when you edit.

Hosmer: Let me see. There was Emma, there was Eva, there was Elizabeth. Those are three aunts that I remember. And Newton was her older brother, and Charlie; Charlie's the one who ran away to South Africa and fought with the Boers against England. [laughter] He was a rebel. I think that was it. And the older brother broke his back in a fall off a horse and that kind of threw everything onto her. And the baby sister; she was given her as her responsibility and she assumed it as she did everything else. The hard way. She accepted the responsibility. Mother tried to put her through school and she [sister] was always getting involved in some romance, that made it very difficult.

But anyhow, Mother taught up there in Washington and finally got enough money to go back to the Oswego State Normal School in New York, which was the best in the country at that time. She entered Oswego State Normal School three weeks late. The limit was four subjects. She took six and had excellents in everything. The only problem was she expected me to do the same kind of thing. [laughs]

Chall: It's hard to live up to that kind of expectation.

Hosmer: But she was a brilliant student and she did a lot of beautiful drawing. Her drawings in mechanical drawing were considered so good they sent them to the Paris Exposition.

Chall: Mechanical drawing was necessary for a teaching credential at that time?

Hosmer: Was it? I didn't know.

Chall: I don't know. I just wonder why she took it.

Hosmer: I don't know. It's just that she probably would have been an engineer today, of some kind.

Chall: How long did she stay in Oswego? About two years? Is that an average for normal school?

Hosmer: I thought it was three.

Chall: It may have been.

Hosmer: But she also worked in a newspaper to help pay expenses. She was one of the first lady reporters. Then when she came back from there, she taught around Washington, and then she went--the better pay was over

Hosmer: in Montana. So she taught up in Montana for a number of years. Then she went from there down to Oregon and she got this job as head of the training department at, I think it was Ashland, it was in here [family papers] someplace.

Chall: There is what used to be a normal school, what is now a state college in Ashland. It might very well have been Ashland.

Hosmer: That is what it was. Ashland, Oregon. She was in charge of this training department of Southern Oregon State Normal School, and preceptress of the young ladies dormitory, connected with the institution. Later on, she became principal of it. And after that she said there were some sort of problems up there in Ashland, but that's when Dad came out from Indiana to teach.

Chall: There?

Hosmer: Yes. He was born in Iowa. No, I believe he was born up in North Dakota. And he worked his way through college by helping in the surveying of the Badlands of South Dakota. He had some real wild tales to tell about that.

Chall: I'll bet. Do you have his birthdate?

Hosmer: No. He was about ten years older than Mother but he never admitted it. He always passed himself off as much younger until some of his relatives came out from Iowa. We found out. He had one older brother and he had two sisters. There wasn't much transportation in those days, and both Mother and Dad were married so late in life. There were a couple of nephews who came out here but I don't even know where they are now. I haven't seen any of them since he died, and he died in '40.

Chall: Your father died in 1940.

Hosmer: During World War I, some of the relatives were around, but I was so little at the time that I don't remember them at all. I remember the name of one branch of the family; I think that was Mother's sister. My father's grandmother was a Scot, and she came over here-- I don't know when--and her husband was Irish. He was a graduate of the University of Dublin. He had been trained to become a priest and he had quit. And so there was a difference right there, but he had a very fine educational background. That was my grandfather.

I don't know too much about Grandma Callan except I remember a picture of her. If you think she looks determined [pointing to picture of her mother] Good heavens! The other one [grandmother Callan] looked like--well, she was big, and she wore one of these outfits. I don't know whatever happened to a lot of those things when they sold the house. I wasn't around.

The Parents of Lucile Hosmer



Edwin Joseph Callan
1890



Lucy Ellen Helm
no date



Mother and Dad on their honeymoon
1902

Chall: What was your father's name?

Hosmer: My father's name was Edwin Joseph Callan; said if he had been born the seventeenth of March he'd have been Patrick.

Chall: There was still that Irish influence. He wasn't reared as a Catholic, was he?

Hosmer: I think he was, but after he got to college he became interested in the scientific facet of it. Because I do know that a lot of the relatives came out and always tried to convert us. Of course Mother's background was pure Baptist, hard-shell Baptist. In fact, Mother didn't even know he had a Catholic background. He never told her. I guess she had been rather outspoken about Catholicism because up in Montana they pretty well controlled it in those days. And she wasn't happy about some of the things that went on up there.

Chall: You mean there were strong Catholics--in Montana?

Hosmer: Well she taught up in mining towns, like Anaconda, Gold Creek, and all of those places. She had an amusing story, while she was up there. It was pretty wild country and you carried a gun with you when you went up there to teach. And they went out on a picnic shortly after she arrived, and in the hotels the partitions stopped about like the top of that picture [pointing to a picture on her wall]. And there were miners, and there were gamblers, there was everything under the sun. So they went out on this picnic and she was in the kitchen fixing something and they said come out and take a shot. Let's see how good you are. So she picked up the rifle and she said, "See that nail? You guys aren't in my class at all." She didn't use the word guys because she was too much of a purist in her language. She lifted up the rifle and drove the nail into the barn.

Chall: Is that right?

Hosmer: [laughs] And she said she never picked up a gun again. Nobody ever bothered her after that.

Chall: How had she learned? Or was it luck?

Hosmer: Well, it was luck, if she did that, but of course she had grown up on a ranch and carried a gun. Of course she rode the whole perimeter of the ranch after her older brother broke his back--for many years.

Chall: So they were ranching in Washington, her family?

Hosmer: Yes, they were ranching.

Chall: I see. When she lived in various communities and taught, did she board?

Hosmer: Oh yes, in most cases she lived with a family. But in some places, you lived sometimes in the hotel, the one and only hotel in the area, until some of the people who would board you decided that you were fit to come into the family. So that made a difference. She had letters from her pupils when I was still growing up.

Mother not only taught them the basics, you know the English and--boy, she was strict. She was a marvelous, marvelous teacher--reading, spelling, and writing, and all of those things that are necessary. But she also taught them elocution. She even put on maypole dances for the neighborhood kids when we were growing up in San Francisco, because she thought that it was such a pity that they had missed that sort of thing. She was quite a traditionalist and an extremely patriotic person. She knew her history and loved American history very much.

The story was that one of my ancestors was an aide-de-camp to George Washington; that's what got me started going back in to genealogy --Captain Helm--and there was a Captain Helm, if I could only tie the thing together. But she also told me that my grandfather had fought with Robert E. Lee in the war with Mexico. I wrote back to the army records and I got proof that he was with Robert E. Lee in the war with Mexico in 1848.

Chall: Did your mother belong to the DAR?

Hosmer: No, she didn't.

Chall: Do you?

Hosmer: No, because I've never verified it.

Chall: I see, it all has to be proved.

Hosmer: And of course my grandmother and grandfather were married in Hangtown in 185- [noise on tape; could not hear the date]

Chall: That's your--

Hosmer: That's my mother's mother and father. After the war with Mexico my grandfather went back to Missouri and then he came across the plains in 1849. This is a funny thing that I found. [showing pictures and other personal papers] The house burned down, and the Bible burned down, and here are some family records. So that's a help. There's Melissa, one of. . . My grandmother's name was Sara Cordelia Helm, and my grandfather's name was Shelby Weedon Helm, although in many of the records, in the old records, it's down as Weedon Helm. See, they had so many that died early.

Hosmer: [reading from family records] My grandfather was born in 1829. And Sara Cordelia Helm was born, the year of our Lord, 1835. But they don't say where. Then there was the Price family; there's another Helm that was born in 1860, and then Mother was born in 1869. Eva was her sister--Eva Esther Cordelia, 1871; and Charles--I don't know what that middle name is. Can you tell it?

Chall: Hiram, I think.

Hosmer: That sounds right--1873. But there's nothing about where. My grandfather enlisted from Springfield, Missouri; he was discharged in Independence; he was born in Johnson County, in Missouri--Rake County--in 1831.

You know, they had different spellings in just about everything. Every county clerk had his own version, so here it's spelled W-e-e-d-i-n and here W-e-e-d-o-n. See, this [document] was in the Mexican war.

Chall: Those are good documents.

Hosmer: So someday, when I don't have anything else to do, [laughter] I'll do something about this.

Chall: Well, it will be nice to get them in order, because they really are interesting to have.

Hosmer: Yes, they are.

Chall: Well, let's see. Now, we have your parents married in Ashland and I guess we'll probably pick up some other threads about your mother and father. Was your father trained as a surveyor or engineer? What was his background, what was he teaching?

Hosmer: He was a physics and geology professor, had his bachelor of science, and also he had a degree in pedagogy--which is education--which qualified him as a teacher. That's what they called it in those days.

Chall: And he was born in North Dakota, right?

Hosmer: Yes. Then he went to the University of Indiana at Valparaiso. I think I showed you--

Chall: Yes, you showed me the certificate. But he lived most of his life in Iowa?

Hosmer: I don't know. I don't know. All I know is that he came out to Ashland, Oregon and taught in the same school where Mother was teaching. That's where the romance started, and that's where they got married.

Chall: When were they married? Do you have the date?

Hosmer: We have the certificate.

Chall: That's right, we have it. Beautiful. Pretty elaborate.

Hosmer: One thousand nine hundred and two. Pastor of the Presbyterian church.

Chall: They were married at Jacksonville.

Hosmer: Ashland, Oregon.

Chall: Jacksonville is a little town right near Ashland.

Hosmer: And they went on their honeymoon on their bicycles to Crater Lake.

Chall: Oh my goodness! That's really a trip.

Hosmer: I've even got a picture of them here.

Chall: On bicycles.

Hosmer: I think I have a picture of them someplace. This was on their trip to Crater Lake.

Chall: Look at the dress and all! Imagine! [laughter]

Hosmer: Imagine bicycling in something like that. Well, Mother was quite an accomplished horseback rider. I know that. I had a picture someplace; I can't seem to locate it right now.

This is my father when he was younger. It was a picture of Jimmy Rolph signing this bill that my father got through the state legislature. This was, oh, years later. He was the one that went on radio--you know we didn't have T.V. in those days--and sold the state retirement system to the people. The constitutional amendment,

Chall: Your father?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Well, let's get back a bit. Let's see. They were married in 1902. Then did they both continue to teach?

Hosmer: They did for a while, then they came to San Francisco.

Chall: When?

Hosmer: Well, my brother was born in San Francisco in 1904. He was three years--two and a half to three years before me. Because they were here at the time of the earthquake. I wasn't born until after the earthquake. My brother was about eighteen months old at the time, and that was April.

Chall: I see. Your brother's name is what?

Hosmer: Victor Arnold Callan.

Chall: And what did your parents do when they came to San Francisco? What did they plan to do?

Hosmer: Well, Mother had had all she wanted of country life. Dad went into business with this guy [pointing to him in photograph] in the real estate business.

Chall: You don't know his name?

Hosmer: His name is Russell, but I can't remember it beyond that.

Chall: Yes, I see. "Russell & Callan."

Hosmer: And he evidently absconded with all our funds, this Russell.

Chall: After a short time in business or after they'd built up trust?

Family Interest in Politics

Hosmer: My dad was a typical college professor, and he was no good, he was absolutely no good in the big city. And of course Mother was tied down with youngsters at that time, and it made for very unhappy circumstances. They were both wonderful people, but boy they were just about as different as day is night. Dad would go down the street composing poetry in his head way up in the sky.

When Dad was elected to the state legislature we lived up in Napa County, up near Rutherford, in what they call Poke Valley now. We lived there for four or five years, on the farm.

Chall: That means that your father and mother moved from San Francisco to--

Hosmer: Napa County--Rutherford.

Chall: When?

Hosmer: Well, he was in [shuffling of papers] it's got to be in here some place.

Chall: Seventh day of December, 1908.

Hosmer: So then he went in, in 1909; he was in for two years. I don't know if he served one term or two terms. I think he served two terms.

Chall: That was the state assembly?

Hosmer: Yes, California State Assembly.

Chall: And he was the representative from Napa.

Hosmer: No, he was the representative from the thirty-ninth district.

Chall: I see, then after--

Hosmer: Then after he went into Sacramento, Mother moved up there with us.

Chall: I see. Okay. [interruption; phone call] Your father was elected from the Thirty-ninth Assembly District and you moved to Napa County shortly after the November 1908 general election.

Hosmer: The problem was that both my mother and I had very bad bronchitis. So while Dad was in Sacramento, I don't know whether we bought it, or leased it or what, we lived there, in Napa County. And of course he had to have a residence in San Francisco.

As I remember, he was in there for two terms; he had a record of having voted ethically right in all bills, but he just didn't. . . He was not a politician. He had a good Irish name, but really, they found out that he didn't belong to the Church. It didn't help him too much, politically, because they [Catholics] controlled San Francisco very, very much in those days.

Chall: How did he manage with the kind of personality he had? I'm not sure whether by this time he had failed in business or not; but how did he manage even to think: one, of going to Sacramento, and secondly of gathering the votes.

Hosmer: Well, he had a wonderful personality, and he had a gift of language that was really quite remarkable. He was a very handsome man, and very dignified and proper but he could roar like a bull when he felt like it. He was just that type. But he didn't have any problems with that; it was just that he was not. . . He had an Irish talent that really kept him abreast of political affairs.

Hosmer: In fact, he was with [William] Burns and those who--I guess that's where he got into politics--those who sent Abe Ruef and all that crew to prison, after the earthquake because of the chicanery that went on--the sand that they put into the construction of the buildings, the city buildings.

Chall: That was a reform group, I think.

Hosmer: Also, he was with a reform group in education, with Professor Brown, and they cleaned out the state Department of Education. In fact they were always active in things like that. This is one of the reasons, I suppose, that I became interested in politics, because it was always discussed at home, and we were brought up with the idea that we had a responsibility towards our government, and towards our city, and our community. And if we didn't like something, we did something about it. But if we didn't go in and do something about it, we had no right to complain.

We were fortunate in that we had extremely interesting civic discussions at home. I didn't think anything of it at the time, it was just part of my daily life. We did have a lot of relatives around at that time. They were all a lot older but Mother was very hospitable; an excellent cook. We all grew up plump. So we had a lot of interesting things happen at home, with the people that my father knew.

Chall: Did you continue to live on that street?

Hosmer: No, we moved to Twenty-Seventh Avenue, right off of Lake Street. Just the other side of the Golden Gate Bridge. We bought this house out there; even had an attic.

Chall: That was way out of town--

Hosmer: They didn't do that until 1922. We lived on Twelfth Avenue after Sixth. You know these big flats they used to have in San Francisco? We lived in another flat on Twelfth and then we moved out to Twenty-Seventh Avenue in 1922. I was going to high school at the time.

Chall: Do you recall people with whom your father was associated in city politics in that reform group? Those who were in your house, or being talked about?

Hosmer: I do know that Burns, the detective, was there. I do know that Brown, Professor Brown and his family, were; we were very close to them. And Dad was a very good friend of the man who used to be the district attorney here in San Mateo County because they'd both gone to Valparaiso. They used to come and take our flat and we'd come down and take theirs. You know, I was trying to think of his name the other day and I can't remember it.

Chall: It will come, or we'll look it up.

Hosmer: It's one of those things that you can find. And I remember that Julius Kahn--what was the woman's name--who was a congresswoman from San Francisco? She lived down the street from us and one morning I disappeared and Mother came hunting for me; I had gone down visiting them in my nightgown. [laughter]

Chall: She [Florence Prag Kahn] came in after her husband died.

Hosmer: Then of course he knew Marshall Hale senior very well. I don't remember names. I remember people coming in and out of the house. But we had an upstairs and we children were generally sent up, out of the way. Sometimes we'd slip down to hear what was going on. I can remember sneaking downstairs one time and they were talking about white slavery in Chinatown, and you know for years I was scared to death to go down there. Because I heard all about the underground, all the tunnels and everything. I was absolutely petrified for a long, long time.

And then on the other side of the coin, there was my grandfather, after he became a Baptist minister.

Chall: Which grandfather is this?

Hosmer: That was my mother's father. When he and my grandmother were married up in Hangtown, he was a deputy sheriff up there. He was six feet four or five, so he would be something like Gunsmoke in size. The Chinese used to come to him, because they figured he was helpful and truthful. He was very friendly to them and they were friendly to him, because he was a white man who was good to them.

There was an interesting anecdote that Mother told me about when they were living, I think it was in Lake County. She was born in Lake County in '69. Yes, that would be it. While they were still living in Lake County there was quite a colony of southerners in that part, and he was a Paul Revere because the northerners in California were determined that we were going to go into the Union on the side of the North. And they would raid the southern colonies here. People did. I've never seen it in a history book, but she can remember her mother--running bullets. But whether she remembered it or heard it I don't know because it was during the Civil War period.

My grandfather had one brother who fought with the North and one brother who fought with the South, and he spent all of his life trying to reconcile them. But I don't think he ever managed to do it. He'd ride around the various farms, and they had one particular place where they went for defense. And they had heard of these raids. They just came and massacred them.

- Hosmer: Well you know, California was considered a pivotal state, not only for strength of the union, but also because of the Almaden mines. That's why it was so important, and the northern settlers were determined that it was to go in on the side of the Union.
- Chall: I see. Your mother's family then all came from the South, originally.
- Hosmer: Originally Kentucky; Missouri. Some of them went down into Texas and they still hate the damned Yankees down there because the Yankees burned the houses and molested the women. That happened back in Missouri. Not exactly in sequence but--
- Chall: That's all right.
- Hosmer: One thing reminds me of something else, it's kind of hard to get it in order.
- Chall: That's hard with family stories. Well, let's see now. Your father went to the assembly, and he was there only two years.
- Hosmer: Four years I think. Two terms.
- Chall: Two terms. I have 1909 to 1911 but it probably was--*
- Hosmer: 1913. In fact I saw a picture of it. I was in Sacramento one time in the assembly where it showed where he was.
- Chall: And did he choose not to run again? Of course you were very young at the time.
- Hosmer: I don't know. I couldn't tell you.
- Chall: He just didn't go back.
- Hosmer: But then he became a member of the state wharfingers. It's the same old thing in politics. They promised him something and when the election was over it wasn't there. But he took some of the tests under the Harbor Commission and he worked for them for the rest of his life.
- Chall: And you came back to San Francisco.
- Hosmer: We didn't stay up on the farm very long.
- Chall: Why didn't your father go back into teaching?

*Don A. Allen, Sr. lists F.J.F. Callan, from the 39th Assembly District, 1909-1911. Legislative Sourcebook, 1849-1965. Published by the Assembly of the State of California, p. 400.

Hosmer: I haven't any idea. Well of course in those days, with both of them, they weren't qualified teachers in California. They'd have to go back to college for two or three years.

Chall: Is that right?

Grammar School Education at Home

Hosmer: It was really quite bad. That's why Mother didn't go back to teaching. But she had her own school. She taught both my brother and me at home. She wouldn't let us go to the public schools. She thought they were terrible.

Chall: But just the two of you. She didn't gather around a private kindergarten?

Hosmer: Well, what happened is that people found out that she was teaching us at home. You could do that in those days.

Chall: Yes, you didn't have to go to school.

Hosmer: And they had you take the city ex's [exams]. I took them when I was twelve and I finished them all.

Chall: How long did you stay at home being taught?

Hosmer: All through grammar school.

Chall: The whole time! And your brother?

Hosmer: Yes, he did the same. My brother and my dad didn't get along too well. He left home when he was eighteen. Took off. It was a sad situation but my dad had a trigger temper and they did not get along at all. But anyhow, brother went up through high school, but he's smart as a whip. He had all the brains and the training. You see the foundation my mother gave us, both of us, was equivalent of a high school education.

Chall: By the time you got through the eighth grade. You got through the eighth grade, at home.

Hosmer: Oh yes. She taught us arithmetic, she taught us English. I read all of Shakespeare before I was twelve. And she taught me public speaking, and elocution, and history, and geography. And boy, there wasn't anything that you didn't do and didn't do absolutely correctly. I wasn't allowed to write anything down. I had to keep it in my mind. I had to work out my fractions, and decimals mentally. I was

Hosmer: never allowed to take any notes to the store. I wasn't allowed to go downtown until I knew all streets between where I lived and Market Street. And I could still give them to you. [laughs]

I wish I knew how she taught me to concentrate. When Merritt and I were married it was so funny because I'd be reading the paper and he'd say something to me and I wouldn't hear him. And he couldn't understand it. I read very, very rapidly. It was one of those things. She was a perfectionist. She used the Montessori system to a great degree. She was an advocate of it. But she also was an advocate of drill, drill, drill, drill until you knew your phonics. She used to use the Spear method of teaching arithmetic. I've never seen anything to equal it.

Chall: S-P-E-A-R?

Hosmer: Yes. That was used with blocks. You'd have a block say this big. And this block would go into that block four times, and so this would be one fourth of it. That's how we learned our fractions, with blocks, and cubes, and triangles, and things like that.

Years ago when Merritt and I were involved in a fight in the high school down here in Sequoia, we had meetings down at Stanford. The district used Sequoia High School for an experimental school and students had no choice, they had to go there. Sequoia High School had dropped from top rating down to the bottom and so a group of parents wanted to know why. They gave us a lot of rigamarole, and then they gave the parents a test. I was among them and I passed higher than all of them; so they wanted to know where I had had my training and I told them Spear, and they just pooh-poohed it. And I said, "Did anyone get a higher score?" And they hadn't, not in the math.

Chall: How did your mother get hold of this material that she used?

Hosmer: Well, she kept most of her teaching books and in those days you could get most of these books; most of them came from Ginn and Company. They were one of the big people. She had them. She had all of Bancroft. [History of California] She had a lot of her old books, and I wish I knew whatever happened to those things.

Chall: Did your father participate in any of the teaching? In the science or physics?

Hosmer: Not particularly. No. He was too busy with more important things on the outside.

Chall: How did it feel? You were isolated from your peers. How many hours a day did you study this way?

Hosmer: I never felt any isolation because our backyard was the central part of the neighborhood. Mother didn't want us running the streets, so she always had something interesting going on in the backyard where all the young people came to our place. When I was in high school, if friends came to the house and I wasn't there, they'd love to sit down and talk to my mother. Because she just loved young people and she enjoyed working with them. She always sneaked in a little education as she went along, and some training and some knowledge. But I never had any feelings of isolation.

I did have one thing. I was liberated when I was quite young because I was the first girl in the neighborhood to wear a coverall. I was like a little monkey and we had the playground with the rings, and the swings, and all those things. I needed exercise and she wanted to be sure that I got it. So I wore coveralls and the neighborhood mothers gasped for a while, but it wasn't long, because they were all following and doing the same thing. [laughs] I think I have a picture of me in some coveralls there. That's when we were up in the country.

Chall: Did you have school at the same times as all the other children were in school? You followed the same hours?

Hosmer: Oh yes. We followed the same thing.

Chall: I still think it's remarkable that your mother could instill this kind of discipline, not only family discipline, but school discipline as well in two children. [interruption]

Hosmer: Did you find it? See, that's me in the coveralls.

Chall: Yes, but you were so little then. My goodness.

Hosmer: This is my mother; she used to play the violin.

Chall: Your mother played the violin too. Did your mother use a McGuffey reader?

Hosmer: Oh yes. All of those things. I'm always selected to do the writing because people can read my writing. I did use--what was the old--

Chall: Spencer?

Hosmer: Oh she could write; beautiful writing she had. I find when I want to write, to be sure that I have everything very legible I go backwards, and up and down like that because that makes it more. . .

Chall: But that wasn't how you were taught, was it?

Hosmer: No. I was taught both ways. What's that movement where your muscular-- It's not the Palmer, no that's not it. Anyway, I learned to read, and write, and spell. And I learned my history and I learned my geography. I had to bound the states and all that sort of thing.

Chall: You and your brother stayed in the one room together and were you taught simultaneously?

Hosmer: No, not necessarily. He was two years older than I.

Chall: I see. So she started him earlier.

Hosmer: Yes, she started him earlier. And then he went to high school three years before I did. And he went to Polytechnic in San Francisco. He left school and went to work for Ford, got to be a big shot in the union. He was in charge of about fourteen western states for COPE [Committee on Political Education]. And here, with a Republican family!

When we got together the doors shook and the windows rattled and everything. But you know, it didn't both us but it bothered the spouses. [laughter] He'd had infantile paralysis. In those days it was such a . . . Everybody was in such a panic. They had an isolation ward over in Butchertown someplace. My mother used to go over there and bring him back. So after he came back from that Mother spent hours, and hours, and hours, with him. He has one leg not much larger than my arm. But from here up he's like a football player. [pointing to chest and shoulders] But his leg would give out on him.

Chall: Did he wear a brace?

Hosmer: He didn't have to wear a brace but I think he did at one time. I was pretty small when that happened.

But you know--that was the time when Mother would say she didn't have to worry about me. I was strong enough to stand on my own feet. And she carried him around in a hand basket, and just wrecked him that way. She really did. She was always making excuses for his not coming through, but there were none for me. So it was a situation there.

Chall: Was your mother, considering the kind of person that she was, was she interested in women's rights at the time?

Hosmer: Mother was the founder of La Mesa Redonda. That was a round table club.

##

Hosmer: There's my mother and my brother, in an old tintype, out at the beach.

Chall: Your mother really dressed to the hilt, didn't she? Look at that hat.

Hosmer: That hat; that was the ultimate ultimate.

Chall: And who's the other woman?

Hosmer: I don't know. I wish I did. I was trying to identify her. My mother was a beautiful woman.

Chall: Handsome. Not quite so stern there.

Hosmer: Well, she wasn't as stern as these pictures. [Pictures taken when she was at school in Oswego.] When I was working in San Francisco, I took her to the Women's Breakfast Club which was a business and professional women's club that used to meet at the Fairmont. And of course Mother had done some shrinking, and she came up to about my shoulder. I can remember how [laughs] the women were saying how cute she was. And she was. She had a wonderful sense of humor, very witty. And somebody told her about how cute she was and she drew herself up, "Cute. Umph. Me, cute?" [laughs] She was highly indignant that she was called cute.

Chall: How long did she live? What was the date of her death?

Hosmer: It was in early 1951.

Chall: My word!

Hosmer: She was eighty-five. Her hair was that color [brown] when she died. And my dad's hair was snow white at twenty-one. And I was grey at thirty. She was ill for a long time, lived in a convalescent home in Millbrae near my brother.

Mother's Interest in Women's Rights

Chall: Now, I have La, and is it Mesa, M-E-S-A?

Hosmer: Yes, M-E-S-A. Redonda--round. R-E-D-O-N-D-A. This was shortly after World War I that I think that she organized it. And she wrote plays, and they put on plays. In fact, I think she was responsible for the naming of Strawberry Hill in Golden Gate Park. My recollection is that she put on a pageant there, a play, and it was a beautiful thing.

Hosmer: And all these exciting things happened there. They had the caves and everything. I don't know whether they still have them or not. But anyhow, as I remember it, it was because of the pageant she put on with this particular group of club women that got the place named Strawberry Hill.

Chall: Do you have, by any chance, any material on the La Mesa Redonda?

Hosmer: No. I've tried to find some of it.

Chall: Do you know who the women were? Were they from your neighborhood, or from the church?

Hosmer: No, they were from throughout the city. I think that's when Dad was in the legislature.

Chall: I see. The campaign for suffrage in California was an early one, although it had a long history. Do you know at all whether your mother was active in the campaign for suffrage? This was in 1912 and you were pretty small.

Hosmer: I don't know for a fact, but I'm sure she was.

Chall: And if your mother had not had the responsibilities of the home or not had to go back to college for the credential, do you think she would have gone out into the teaching or business world?

Hosmer: I'm sure she would have.

Chall: What were her attitudes, that you know about, towards the so-called woman's role?

Hosmer: She was a very strong WCTU'er, for one thing. [laughs] I'll tell you that. We never had a drop in the house.

Chall: And how about your father? With his Irish background? Did he have to get this drop somewhere else?

Hosmer: He had a good excuse. The doctor said he needed a snifter or two before dinner.

Chall: Where did he get it?

Hosmer: Oh, he had a bottle in the house. You could always tell when he'd had it. He could play the harmonica. He couldn't read a word of music and he couldn't dance, but he'd go skipping around and playing that harmonica and you knew he had a ball. They both had a tremendous charm.

Hosmer: Now wait a minute. You're asking me this question about her attitudes. This is something she wrote, and this is all in rhyme. She was with a seer. [reading]*

He took me up into the dome that towers toward the sun,
 "Now gaze, look carefully," said he, "to see what we have done."
 He opened wide the windows and looked and looked again.
 "I'm sure it's San Francisco, but where are all the men?"
 "I see the women all about, in office, hall and street."
 He said, "They're cooking dinner now and keeping the homes neat."

[laughs] Now this was, remember--

"The women fill the offices and rule the church and state."

[laughs] Did you ask what her feeling was?

"Mesa Redonda always gives her share of the brave and great."

Now you see, that was the name of the organization.

"But are there none in all this club, just women folk like me,
 Who keep the home, and sew and darn and bake and brew the tea?
 The doctor looked at me aghast. He stammered some and then,
 "Why no. No lady does that now. They leave that to the men."

[laughter] I ought to have this published, for some nostalgia.

Chall: That's lovely. Is that all in your mother's handwriting?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. [continues reading]

"I heard of the seer, a wonderful seer,
 With power of such magical might,
 He could draw back the veil,
 Which the future conceals,
 And reveal all to mortals dim sight."

"So I hied me away, to this magical man,
 For much was I pining to know,
 Of futures in stocks,
 Of futures in bonds,
 If the future held wealth, joy or woe."

*When the transcript was edited, the copy from which Mrs. Hosmer was reading was in storage with her other papers. This may not therefore, be wholly accurate. M.C.

Hosmer: [reading continued]

"He rose as I entered, his long, flowing beard,
Like fine snow drifted down to his feet,
His eyes glittered bright,
With intelligent light,
And his smile was assuring and sweet."

"'What wilt thou, my daughter.' 'The future,' I cried,
'The future I much wish to know.
They tell me that nothing
From your light can hide,
Does my future hold pleasure or woe?'"

"Well, my friend, all draws true,
My hopes be filled [it's kind of faint]
All the world of thy great talents--"

"'There are limits to magic,' he smilingly replied.
My light in but one spot I throw.
I can show you the future,
Of a child or a friend,
Your city, your country or soul.'"

"'But with one thing alone, you must be content.
I cannot reveal you the whole.
Come now, my good time
You must not this waste.
There's much that remains to be done.'"

"'Will you see twenty years of the Geary Street road?
Or the future of daughter or son?
Will you glance over the Mexican border
And see whether rubber or powder prevailed?
Will you know if Max Kuhl still sits on the lid,
Or the latest from Paris and--?'"

This is the way it goes on.

Chall: She must have written, I suspect, for one of her pageants.

Hosmer: She did.

If you want to know where she stood, you got an idea, didn't you?

Chall: And so well written.

Hosmer: There wasn't anything that woman couldn't do. There wasn't anything.

Chall: Now what about the church? She was pretty busy at home, I take it.

Hosmer: Well, we all went to the St. John's Presbyterian Church in San Francisco. That was what they agreed upon, because Dad wasn't much of a church goer. But Mother was determined that we were going to have church training.

Chall: You went to Sunday school?

Hosmer: Oh my, yes. I taught in Sunday school for years. I also went to Christian Science church and went to Unity.

Chall: At the same time? While you were young?

Hosmer: While I was growing up. I became a member of the Presbyterian Church, I guess about 1922.

Chall: But you had attended the church and the Sunday school all those years?

Hosmer: Oh yes.

Chall: Did your mother go in mid-week; take you with her? And your brother?

Hosmer: We all went.

Chall: Your father too?

Hosmer: Under protest sometimes, but he went.

Chall: I see.

Hosmer: But he went later. He became a member of the Unitarian church, later on.

Chall: Your father?

Hosmer: It was one extreme--from Catholicism to that. But the Presbyterian church is the one that we went to as we were growing up. It was something that they could agree on. And they both agreed on religious training for young people, on the church. I was very grateful for that background. To me, it's important. It's something to hang on to.

And Bill [William Hosmer], of course, I say at times that he's a throwback to his grandfather. I wouldn't be surprised to have him turn out a preacher yet. [laughs] He's got a marvelous sense of humor. He's the plodder type, you know. Boy, when he's got something, it's got. But I think that this is a good move for him--his present plan to give up the insurance business and go back to school for a degree.

Chall: Yes.

Hosmer: Getting to what he really should be doing.

Chall: Nice to do it at any stage.

Father's Community Interests

Chall: Well now, let me see. Your father, in the years that you were old enough really to know him, was a wharfinger.

Hosmer: Yes, a state wharfinger.

Chall: Did that seem to be a fulfilling kind of job for him, as far as you could tell?

Hosmer: Oh, I'm not sure. He still dabbled in politics. He was still involved in local things that were going on. He wrote poetry too, He was very talented. He's written some that was very lovely, quite different from Mother's.

In their way, they were both dreamers, and both very creative, and both very talented. But Mother had more of a drive than Dad did. Dad was kind of lazy on that side. I think that the great mistake was they needed this. If Dad had stayed in an ivy-covered college he would have been much happier, much better. But he handled whatever he had to do, he had the brilliance to do it, the intelligence.

Chall: Did he enjoy your mother's La Mesa Redonda activities?

Hosmer: Yes. And he was active in Woodmen of the World, and--oh dear, what was the other one? The Odd Fellows. All of those things. He was very active in those things. I can remember the picnics and the barbecues when we took the ferry boat to the other side, to Tiburon. They had a picnic one time on my birthday, and I thought they had done it deliberately for my birthday. [laughter] I was six years old.

Chall: Quite a celebration.

Hosmer: It really was. I couldn't believe my eyes when I saw the size of the cow, or the beef, that was being cooked, and I felt so sorry for the poor thing.

More on Lucile Hosmer's Unique Educational Background

Hosmer: I went to the San Francisco Conservatory of Music and I learned an awful lot there. I was fortunate in my piano teachers. [Alfred] Hertz was one of our teachers. We learned so much of music history, music appreciation, and all of those things. And as a result of my going there, I was able to usher at the symphonies, and the operas, and things like that. So that was a wonderful experience that I had.

Chall: Did you do that during, before, or after high school?

Hosmer: That was during high school, and probably before, too.

Chall: So your mother didn't give you piano training or any musical training at home?

Hosmer: She taught me how to play.

Chall: The piano?

Hosmer: The beginnings of it.

Chall: How about the violin?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: She didn't train your brother? Usually the girl played the piano, and the boy the violin.

Hosmer: Neither one of us. I don't think she played the violin much after we came back from the ranch. But I can remember her playing it up there, when we were up there alone on the ranch. And I can remember the hours and hours she used to play for us at night. And the other thing we used to do: We used to go out on the ground, put a blanket down, and learn all about the stars. At night, it was dry and hot up there. And I didn't even realize until right now when I was talking about it, that that's how we learned about the various constellations, the Big Dipper, and things like that. She made it always a game. She was just a perfectly natural born teacher. She was a wonderful teacher. When I was a senior in high school, I can remember. . . [door bell rings] That's my son. [Mrs. Chall, Mrs. Hosmer and William [Bill] Hosmer visit briefly]

Chall: Now I think you were telling me earlier about the San Francisco Conservatory, so I think what I'll do is back up and get your training in chronological order. First of all, you went through grammar school under your mother's tutelage.

Hosmer: That's right. And I took the city exams at twelve. My dad insisted upon my going to the convent for a year, a year and a half.

Chall: Is that right?

Hosmer: He still had that background and training enough that a girl should go to the convent.

Chall: So where did you go?

Hosmer: I went to St. Rose Academy. It was a day school, a Dominican convent in San Francisco.

Chall: Is it still existing?

Hosmer: Oh yes. And then they have the Dominican College over in San Rafael. As far as I know it is still there. And I did learn a great deal, but Mother was so afraid that I might get converted that I transferred to Girls High at the end of the year.

Chall: I see. So you had one year there?

Hosmer: Yes. Or was it a year and a half? I've forgotten which now.

Chall: How did that seem to you?

Hosmer: Oh, I enjoyed it. I didn't have any trouble getting along with people, because, as I say, Mother always made a point of having my peers, as we call them today, children of my own age. Everybody wanted to come to our house, to our yard. We had a big swing in the back, we had rings. We had all kinds of things. We had a regular playground in the backyard. Plus a garden. We had our vegetables and raised our lettuce, and our tomatoes, and our string beans. She was indefatigable in many, many ways.

So, then I went to Girls' High.

Chall: Now Girls' High, you were there, what? Three years.

Hosmer: Three years.

Chall: And what did you study at Girls' High?

Hosmer: Public speaking and history, regular courses.

Chall: Were you college bound?

Hosmer: Yes. But I was only sixteen when I finished there. So Mother insisted that I take a year at Galileo High School so I'd be in a mixed group. So I went over to Galileo for a year.

Chall: What did you study?

Hosmer: Well, I was mostly debating and there wasn't a sport that I wasn't in. I was in tennis, I was in swimming, I was in crew, I was in basketball, that's how I got my nose broken.

Chall: In Girls' High?

Hosmer: In Girls' High, and in Galileo too. I was on a crew team in Galileo, and drill team, all that sort of thing. And public speaking.

But at Girls' High, I almost had my heart broken there. I got to be school yell leader. And I got it because I could whistle with my fingers. And I practiced and I practiced and I practiced. They had this award for an all-around student, a gold G. I had been on the debating team, and I had been in sports. And my civics teacher wouldn't recommend me because I was not a lady, because I whistled with my fingers. Miss Hobe.

Chall: Miss Hobe?

Hosmer: I have a friend who had her when she was there, and she is eighty-six, so you can imagine how old she [Miss Hobe] was. She had high buttoned shoes, and her hair tied up in a knot. Marvelous teacher, in civics and history. Sarcastic. She'd give me a C one month, and an A the next month. And you don't swing quite that much. But she didn't think that I was entitled to the award. My debating coach fought for me and everything else, but it was because I was not a lady.

Chall: What did your mother think of that?

Hosmer: Well, she was fit to be tied, but there wasn't anything you could do about it. It was so funny when I went to get my credits that the vice-principal, Miss Daniels, they called her in and asked her about me; and she said, "Well, she must be all right. I don't know her." [laughs] She handled all the disciplinaries. I'll never forget her. She was tall and spare, scared everybody to death in the place.

So I went to Galileo. And then Dad decided that it was foolishness for me to go to college. Women just got out and got married anyhow. So, I left home for two years, went down to San Mateo Junior College, worked in a private home near the campus, and got my room and board. I went to college. And then I went to summer session at San Francisco State, and I went to summer session at Cal [University of California at Berkeley]. I guess San Francisco State I went twice. Cal I went twice. Then I transferred over to Berkeley in my junior year, and I went in the summer to get acclimated to Cal. And then I took off for one year. I wanted to have one year when I wouldn't have to work and to to school. And I got married instead. I'm still on leave of

Hosmer: absence; I can show you my slip. But I never stopped studying. And I only had twelve units to go and I just can't get over how dumb I was. I was only nineteen.

Chall: Twelve units to graduate with a B.A.? And you took off and got married. You were pretty young then.

Hosmer: I was nineteen. But I would never have done it if I hadn't been so tired. Because when I was at Cal I had a job; I took classes; I had an eight o'clock, a nine o'clock, and a ten o'clock, and I went to work at 11:30.

Chall: Doing what?

Hosmer: Waiting tables. And then I went back and had a one o'clock, and a two o'clock, and a three o'clock. Then I'd work from 5:30 to 8:30 and then I went to study.

Chall: That sounds like a heavy load.

Hosmer: It was, much too heavy.

Chall: What were you studying? What were you aiming for?

Hosmer: Mother insisted that I had to be a teacher, and that kind of made it difficult. I majored in public speaking and history. But I went into the debating end, not the dramatic end. I had English, and I had history. I took German and Spanish both in the junior college. Took two years of each, but I didn't go on with either one of them.

My downfall was astronomy, and I got a hold of a teacher who was just nuts on the mathematics of the universe. He was so far over our heads in that. That was the only course I ever flunked. I think I got a D in it. I didn't do as well as I should have done, or could have done. But I was just too tired, and that was it. And I wouldn't have got married when I did but this friend, this boy, he was afraid he'd lose me.

Marriages, Work, and Study

Chall: Was he much older than you?

Hosmer: No, there was only a difference of about a year and a half. We were married for ten years, and Bill is his son. He was an engineer, and bright but. . . He went to church with me and then I found out he was an atheist. A lot of things. And then after we'd been married he got involved with married women, and I took it all. Of course I was brought up not to believe in that sort of thing.

Hosmer: So I finally left my husband and went back to my folks, and lived in the city, and went back to work in the same store I had once worked in. From the time I was sixteen I had worked at Hale Brothers in all the various departments. They took me back, and then inside of a year and a half, my dad died suddenly. So then I had Bill and my mother to support. Hales gave a class in merchandising and buying at eight o'clock in the morning and I went and took that. Started out with fifty in attendance and ended up with five. So the five of us that stayed with it got promotions. I became an assistant buyer, costume jewelry.

And then when I was settled in that spot, I went to classes in the morning in art school--Maria von Riddlestein Art & Style Studio. She was an education in herself. Marvelous teacher. She held a chair of art in Turkey, and Bavaria, and in South America. She and her husband, he was a Baron von Riddlestein, had been decorated by Queen Victoria. She was fascinating. I learned more about international politics and things just talking to her. I took interior decorating, and we had to go out to museums and learn to sketch the various periods of furniture, and work in water color. My mother just laughed over that because she said she had tried to teach me and I did my drawing with an eraser. I usually had a hole in the paper before [laughter] I got to the point where we finished it. But I learned to draw so that the chairs wouldn't dump you off.

Then at night I went to a public speaking group--Beckmann Hollister and Company which taught business executives. I hadn't done any public speaking for years and years so I took that up again. In those days they made records of your voice and then played them back. They taught you how to line up your talks for points instead of memorizing, things like that. Of course we always memorized everything when I was going to school.

I had decided that I was never, never, never going to get married again. And then Merritt came along and we went together about five years before he talked me into it.

Chall: Is that right?

Hosmer: We were married twenty-six years before he died; we were very compatible, very happy. And he was wonderful to Bill. He was a San Franciscan, he was SAR [Sons of the American Revolution], and the Society of California Pioneers. His folks crossed the Isthmus of Panama. Mine came across the plains. It was unusual for two Californians.

Chall: How did you happen to meet him?

Hosmer: Well, I had met him once or twice when I was married. Then, one day he came into the store to buy a present for his mother. This was about a year after I had my divorce, and he asked me to go out to dinner. And I thought, well, he's just doing it because he's sorry for me, because everybody knew about what my husband had been doing. I was the last to know. You know how those things are. So we went out to dinner, and it was such a change to be out with somebody that you didn't have to fight off because you were a divorcee. That's rough. So we went out together for almost five years, and we were married in 1942. It was shortly after the beginning of World War II. He asked Bill how he felt about his marrying me, and Bill said, "That's all right with me. I told Mother to ask you to marry us lots of times." [laughter] But Bill always was very resentful because we didn't take him with us on our honeymoon. He was our best man. .

Chall: How old was he at that time?

Hosmer: Twelve. And of course, after I was married, that's when I got involved in the political aspects.

Chall: Now when you had been married the first time, did you live in San Francisco?

Hosmer: I lived in San Carlos.

Chall: Oh, I see.

Hosmer: Part of the time. We moved all the time, moved to San Marino, and San Carlos. We went through the Depression when he was on a fishing boat for the State Department of Fisheries.

We lived around different places. We lived in Berkeley, and we lived in San Bruno, we lived in San Mateo, and we lived in San Carlos. We were just so totally different, which I didn't know at the time. And I was very deeply religious, and wanted to teach Bill. He burned my books. He was quite sadistic in many ways. We went to a psychiatrist for about three months, and the doctor said that it was a waste of time and money, because my husband didn't have any intention of changing and he'd be that way when he was seventy. He said there was some hope for me because I wanted to change. The doctor said that if I didn't get out I'd be dead in another year, a year and a half. So I did.

Chall: Was that hard on you, psychologically?

Hosmer: Oh yes. It was a very traumatic experience. When I first came back to work I was in the middle of a breakdown, but nobody knew anything about it in those days. That's when I went back to the Christian Science church. I got a lot of help there.

Chall: You say you went back. That means you had been to it once before?

Hosmer: I'd gone to the Sunday school when I was a child.

Chall: Was that because there were children in your neighborhood who belonged? Why else would you go?

Hosmer: No, Mother was always interested in it, and in Unity. She stayed with that for most of her life because she felt there was too much hell and damnation in the orthodox church. She had gone to a Baptist church school, and she taught it, and all that sort of thing. She felt that both of them give you a lot more interpretation of God as love.

Chall: So the Presbyterian thing was just so that you could all--

Hosmer: Yes, the whole family could go. But she didn't feel that Unity interfered with the Presbyterian beliefs. It was just sort of an amplification of it. She was always reaching out looking for new things to learn and study, so that had to do with it.

Chall: Did you find the Christian Science church helpful?

Hosmer: Yes. It helped me to get stability back. After Merritt and I were married it was an entirely different relationship. He had to sit me down one time and say, "When I tell you something, I mean it." Because I was used to these darts that were always being stuck in me, double meanings and stuff like that. I had a very low opinion of myself at that time. It took a long, long time to get over that.

Chall: Now, your husband had been a bachelor for--

Hosmer: Forty-four years.

Chall: Never married?

Hosmer: Never married. He was nine years older than me.

Chall: Interesting. Your father had been a bachelor, and your husband, and now even your son, each in his forties before marriage.

Hosmer: I hadn't thought about that before. Yes.

Chall: Some men do hold out for the "right" woman.

Hosmer: They do. Bill has got very strong ideas about what he wants, and what he wants in a woman, and they're not easy to find--what he's got in mind. [laughs] I wouldn't be surprised to see him marry somebody that has been married and has children. Give him kids. He taught in Sunday school for a long, long time. He was brought up in Christian Science.

Chall: Oh he was. And does he still belong?

Hosmer: He doesn't belong, but he still works at it.

Chall: I see.

Hosmer: That's a daily thing.

Chall: What about Merritt Hosmer? What was his background?

Hosmer: His mother and father were both Christian Scientist, both readers in the church. I used to go and have a weekly session with his mother after we were married just to learn more about it. She was one of the real old-timers and she had some amazing, remarkable healings that she was able to do for people.

Merritt never studied it though. Merritt always expected his mother to take care of him in that, and then he expected me to do the same without an effort on his part. The teacher I had said that you had to help yourself as you went along. But he was a man of complete integrity and honesty and he was one of the most brilliant men I've ever known.

He had his photographic lab, he had his chemistry lab, he had his electronic lab. He built all of this sound equipment. This room--it's too small for what he built. I gave it to Bill. He had a machine shop. He could sketch in black and white and work in oils. There wasn't anything he couldn't do. But he'd never had to do anything. He had so much ability, and so much brilliance; he didn't ever want to be tied down, and he never wanted to leave San Carlos.

Chall: Was he established in business when you met him?

Hosmer: Oh yes. He'd been in the insurance business since 1928.

Chall: That was his business? Was it called Merritt Hosmer Insurance at that time?

Hosmer: Merritt R. Hosmer Insurance and Real Estate both, but he dropped the real estate because during the Depression he couldn't sell homes that he knew cost \$2,500 for \$15,000. He was too conscientious for that. He had been in that all that time.

He was the youngest councilman they ever had on the city council.

Chall: San Carlos?

Hosmer: Yes, in 1928 that was really something. He was really an upstart. But he was on the council for fourteen years. He was a police commissioner, a fire commissioner. He'd never take the mayor's job. He said once you take the presidency or chairman you immediately become a target. He'd rather work otherwise. Then he was on the school board, Sequoia district school board for eleven years.

Chall: Do you know those dates? We'll fill them another time.

Hosmer: It's been a long time.

Chall: I wanted to know something about that house that he grew up in; did you move into that as soon as you were married?

Hosmer: No, no. His mother was still alive. We lived about a block from there.

Chall: That was in Redwood City?

Hosmer: No, San Carlos. You know where the Safeway store is down there?

Chall: No.

Hosmer: It's about four blocks up from El Camino. Now, an apartment house is on the location of the family home. It had been built in 1886 and it had a full basement. It was all cemented and that's where Merritt had all his things, downstairs. It wasn't a large place. We lived about a block from there and Merritt went to see his mother every day. She was in her eighties, she must have been eighty-six or eighty-seven.

And I thought of all the various illnesses and problems I'd had, and that Merritt would outlive me by years and years and years. But he used to keep telling me, "No, I'm not going to be here." And I'd say we'd have that famous fiftieth wedding anniversary. "No, no," he'd say. "I'm not going to live that long." And I guess he had that premonition. I guess they get it sometimes, because periodically he'd say it wouldn't be long now, something like that. And yet he didn't know anything was wrong with him.

Chall: He didn't ever feel ill.

Hosmer: No. He had trouble with his back once in a while, and that was about it. But finally, when he couldn't get in and out of his car, then we went to the doctor and he found all these holes all through here, and it was getting into his bones and his legs.*

*Merritt Hosmer died in 1969 at the age of sixty-eight.

Chall: You say went to a doctor. You actually--As Christian Scientist.

Hosmer: Well, he wasn't that much of a Christian Scientist.

Chall: How about his mother? Was she ill before she died?

Hosmer: She was ill for a very short period of time. I stayed over at the house with her the last few days. But she wouldn't have a doctor. She didn't want a doctor.

Chall: I see.

Did he have any brothers or sisters?

Hosmer: No brothers or sisters. He had his mother and his father and his father's stepmother and his mother's father all around the house at one time. They all circulated around Merritt. He was the center of the universe. It was quite an education, getting adjusted to that. [laughs] We had a few problems. This friend of mine was school superintendent in San Carlos for many years, he said I really pulled myself by my boot straps to redeem my individuality. I had these two friends, each named Ruth who were very dear friends. They helped me. One's in Montana now and the other one is up in Provo, Utah. It was quite a problem; but he was so good, basically so good. And if I hadn't had the experience I'd had before I couldn't have taken it, but eventually I learned I just had to stand up for my rights. It took me five years to get an allowance of my own. [laughs] But Merritt came from a German and English background--the man was boss of the house.

Chall: And that's after you had been on your own.

Hosmer: Oh yes. That was after I'd been on my own, and that was part of it. That's what made it difficult. I don't think I could marry again, because I don't have anybody that I have to answer to now about anything. And Bill won't even take a penny from me. It's like hitting him over the head with a brick to get him to take anything from me because he doesn't believe in that.

Chall: So, it took you five years to get an allowance?

Hosmer: And a car to drive of my own. And then when I first got my car to drive, I couldn't go outside of the county with it. [laughs] "Next thing you know, you'll want to go to San Francisco, and then you'll go to Sacramento." Well, he was right. [laughter] And then, you know, he had his car. He could drive our cars. I let Bill drive my car but he wouldn't let Bill drive his. He always had Lincolns and Cadillacs. And then when he wanted a new one, he always paid cash. No credit. He always paid cash. So I was the only one

Hosmer: in the family that had any credit because when I was working I had accounts at the store, and when school came, I always had one of these sixty-day charges, ninety-day charges and things. So I would pay them up in about six weeks time, which blows them out of their minds. But I couldn't stand to owe money because I had been brought up not to-- And I still feel that way. I've got to have all my bills paid before I can take off on a trip. I wouldn't go if I hadn't saved the money to go. I couldn't go down to the bank and borrow money to take a trip. It's just against all my instincts and my training.

But Merritt was very, very proud of what I did. He said he didn't give his life to his country, he gave his wife. [laughs] He had other interests but he could talk to me about his audio engineering. He was the only non-engineer in the Audio Engineering Society because he knew so much about audio; he built big speakers and equipment. He just was remarkable. He had a friend he'd known since 1926; he first met him when he [Merritt] was forty, and he was always after Merritt to go into business with him but he couldn't get Merritt to do it. Merritt didn't want to leave San Carlos. I think his mother had a lot to do with it. He was safe there. It was a security blanket.

But during World War II he drove back and forth from San Carlos over to Boeing near where the Oakland Airport is today, over in that area. He taught aviation mechanics. He was head of the electrical shop, and he wrote the textbook that they used.

Chall: Had he gone to college?

Hosmer: Oh, he'd gone to Stanford but he quit because of this stupid chemistry professor. He was going to be a chemical engineer, and the chemistry professor said, "Oh, you don't want to go into that." He said, "You'll only make \$525 a month." And Merritt said, "Well, the heck with that now. I'm not going to waste four years for that salary." I heard about it. He was so brilliant. He finished high school in three years. He was doing college chemistry, when he went down to Stanford. Imagine the professor doing that! So Merritt was always studying, just like I was, but his interest was in the fields of calculus and chemistry.

When Dr. Samuel Glasstone was out here--he was the man who wrote the books on nuclear reactors--Merritt had written a policy for him and we got acquainted with him and his wife. He said Merritt was the only nonscientist he knew that he could really sit down and talk to about scientific matters. His wife was so pleased to meet me because she said I was the only wife she'd met in America who wasn't talking about babies, and bottles, and playing bridge, and things like that. She had come over here on a Guggenheim Fellowship in botany. Charming, wonderful people.

Chall: And the name was?

Hosmer: G-L-A-S-S-T-O-N-E--Dr. Samuel. He graduated from Oxford, I think, at nineteen and had to wait until twenty-one to get his degree, with all the rules and regulations.

Merritt had a natural curiosity, and he had a marvelous sense of humor, and he thought so fast, and he was so far ahead of everybody else around. It was a long, long time before he and Bill hit a plateau of real understanding, because he thought fast and Bill had to build brick by brick. Merritt would push and push and Bill would get confused and then he'd just quit. I had such a time trying to make Merritt understand that, because Bill is as brilliant in his way as Merritt was but he's just far more slower in his working out of things. He's considered quite an authority in municipal bonds and things like that, but he's dug it out slowly and methodically.

Well, anyhow, after Merritt and I were married, the first few years, I didn't do anything more than try to get adjusted to his way of life.

II MOVING UP THE LADDER; LOCAL AND STATE POLITICS, 1946-1965

[Interview 2: December 10, 1975]##

Hosmer: You know, because I'm against the ERA doesn't mean I'm--I'm against women's rights; I'm just against the way this bill is written. And I'll tell you later other women, other people that you might see about the book part of it.

Chall: Oh, fine.

Since it's been such a long time since we met, I wanted to recap just briefly your early years before you got into politics, when you were first married. I think you told me that your husband had been an only child, that he was well cared for by his mother and grandmother.

Hosmer: His mother, father, grandmother, and grandfather. But he was a very dedicated person, very dedicated to the town of San Carlos. He served on the city council for fourteen years, and he served on the Sequoia High School board for eleven years, two different times, and he was very dedicated to that. He was an extremely brilliant man and he had all kinds of hobbies--chemistry, photography, and he worked in audio engineering and all of those things.

The Sequoia Union High School District Board Elections, 1946

Chall: Now, I think you told me that he expected, I guess, that his wife would be a homebody, though he probably didn't put it that way.

Hosmer: He did. But it was interesting; the way I got into politics was because we were having a real hassle on the Sequoia High School board, and even in those days, Merrett's business was picketed, and so was another man's business--a jeweler in Redwood City--because they were in opposition to the tactics of a group of Sequoia teachers we called the "furious fifteen." They controlled the jobs of the other teachers, and it was really quite a situation.

Hosmer: What had distressed Merritt about the whole situation was the fact that Sequoia High School used to be number one on Stanford's list, you know, of qualified students, and it had gone down almost to the bottom. So, he wanted to know why--having gone to Sequoia and graduated in three years and gone to Stanford and all that.

He was upset about it, and then he found out through, oh, terrible probing--you know, just digging and digging--that it had become an experimental school for Stanford School of Education. Well, now, Berkeley had an experimental school near Berkeley High, but people had a choice over there, that if they didn't want to go to an experimental school they could go to another high school.

So, that was the beginning of the battle.

Chall: What year was that?

Hosmer: That was about '44. He was involved in it when we were first married.

And, so, he was reelected in '44 and then he came up again in '46.

Chall: They were two-year terms?

Hosmer: Yes. Well, maybe I'm wrong now. I won't swear to--yes, I think they were two-year terms. And I remember that he was quite distressed because while he won, he won by about 150 votes. There had only been a voter turnout of maybe four or five hundred in the whole district. Now, this included all from San Mateo down through Redwood City, so he was upset.

He maintained that the teachers had gotten a bill through to hold these elections in an off-election year in order to control them. But, anyhow, there was a terrible battle going on. [tape off briefly]

Chall: Let's see. In 1946, at least, you knew that he was up for election again.

Hosmer: He was up for election to the school board again.

Chall: There were what, five members on the school board?

Hosmer: Five members, yes. He and Mr. Hilton were running. That was the other member that was fighting this.

Chall: Mr. Hilton was on Mr. Hosmer's side?

Hosmer: Yes. So, anyhow, Merritt had quite a good following of people who liked what he was doing and what he was trying to do and were very concerned with the way parents were treated. If any parent objected

Hosmer: to what the children were learning or weren't learning, they were always referred to as dumb, stupid, and things like that; and the children took quite a beating in the school if their parents objected to anything that the teachers were doing.

Chall: Can you recap for me what it was that he was opposed to in terms of the actual problems--the issues?

Hosmer: Well, he was opposed to one of the core curriculums--the social living courses mainly. The way the school was handling it, a student would get one teacher for two years in what they called a social living course in which there were four or five subjects, and they could teach any one of those four or five subjects. So if the teacher liked art, that's all they learned was art, and if it was, oh, biology, all they had was biology, and so on and so forth. The youngsters just were not learning a balanced program and they were not able to pass the tests that were going on down at Stanford.

We had some real wild battles with the Department of Education down at Stanford, and we even had a Dr. [John Conrad] Almack who was hired to do a survey of the programs and what was going on. He was in the Stanford School of Education and he was very highly regarded. And, you know, when the report came, the teachers opened it and reviewed it and wrote a critique of it, opposing it, before any member of the board of trustees even saw it. Well, of course, Merritt just went up in smoke on that one along with some other people.

So, they had a tremendously hot battle that year. So, Mary Cereghino--she still lives in Redwood City--was handling Merritt's campaign on a volunteer basis. She is an ex-newspaperwoman. She's known me since I first came into this picture. [chuckle] She said to Merritt, "Why in the world don't you get your wife involved in precinct work? We need all the help we can get."

Chall: That was for his campaign?

Hosmer: That was for his campaign. And I didn't know anything at all about precinct work. I didn't know anything at all. I had belonged to the Women's Breakfast Club, and, of course, Dad's having been in the state legislature, I'd heard some sort of talk, but it was all a pretty vague kind of thing. But for any practical political experience, I had absolutely nothing.

So, I got started in that. That was my first experience in precinct work and political activity.

Chall: What did you do for your husband in that campaign? That was the 1946 campaign?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Did you organize some of the precincts, or just help Mrs. Cereghino?

Hosmer: Just take the precinct lists and call people and tell them what the issues were, and get the mailings out, and all that sort of thing. This is what you call the nitty-gritty of politics.

The California Republican Assembly, 1944

Chall: Yes.

Hosmer: But I overlooked something. In 1944, I guess it was, shortly after we were married, they organized the California Republican Assembly [in San Mateo County.]* Merritt had some friends in it, and so we used to go to some of the meetings and became members of it; there weren't very many. And then right around the end of the year, the woman who had done publicity for them had died, so they asked me to take over as publicity chairman for the rest of the term of that particular group. I'd had--what was the course we had in high school on newspaper. . . ?

Chall: Journalism?

Hosmer: Journalism. I had that, and that's why they thought I might be qualified.

Then, they had a lot of meetings out of the county and I didn't believe in going off and leaving my son--he was small at the time--and Merritt didn't like the idea, so I became a member of the Republican Women in San Mateo County in 1945. [The California Federation of Republican Women]

Chall: Did you then give up your membership in the assembly?

Hosmer: Not at that time. I was on the state level at that time and I helped Ed Shattuck and I think [Thomas W.] Caldecott, in organizing and writing by-laws and the constitution and things like that.

*The CRA was organized in 1935, and only countywide charters were granted until after 1948.

Chall: How did you get into the state level?

Hosmer: Well, there wasn't much competition [laughter] for people doing that. They were trying to get people. They had these meetings once a year, or something like that, and I went to one or two of them.

Chall: I see. How active was the local one, the San Mateo County Assembly?

Hosmer: Well, we met monthly.

Chall: I see. Were there many women, or did the women come with husbands?

Hosmer: No. Husbands and wives came, yes. It was a joint--it was a husband-and-wife approach; it still is. But, I mean, there are more separated couples today than there were then, you see, but they were active at that time.

Chall: So, women can join on their own if they want to?

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: But at that time it wasn't done much?

Hosmer: I don't know. I don't remember. I don't think they'd turn anybody down. Neither Republicans or Democrats would turn down a membership, because that's where they get their [chuckle] workers and their fund raisers, you see.

Chall: So, they met here monthly. And that was, what, a dinner meeting, with a speaker?

Hosmer: Yes, these were dinner meetings, or we met in the city hall, or sometimes in San Carlos. We used to go from town to town to drum up trade [laughter], as the saying goes. After dinner there was a speaker and discussion of issues, and things like that.

But then Merritt was so busy that he couldn't go to them and he didn't want me going by myself, so I didn't go out. There was only the one car at that time. And, so, I became a member of the San Mateo County Federation of Republican Women. It was a countywide organization at that time.

I started as secretary and then I became vice-president and program chairman and then I became president.

Chall: I think the organization had been established in about 1938.

Hosmer: That's right.

The San Mateo County Federation [Council] of Republican Women, 1945

Chall: Was it a small group getitng started here?

Hosmer: It was a small group, yes. They'd had a larger group, and then there was some sort of a hassle within the organization and they split. The organization split and half of the group went to the south (the southern county group), from, I think, Menlo and Atherton, maybe Redwood City. And then half of us stayed up in the northern part.

At that time, we had a real angel as president, Annette Alexander had the Alexander Sanitarium and, I mean, she was an angel to the Republican women and to the Republican party. She loved being president and she wanted me as vice-president so I could do the work. [chuckle] She must have been close to eighty, but, boy, she was successful. She let us have our meetings at her estate in Woodside.

She had this convalescent home and--I don't know what it was--a sanitarium. It was the Alexander Sanitarium, in Belmont, which was quite famous at one time.

Chall: At the time you joined, she was the president of the--what was this? The northern section?

Hosmer: Yes, the northern section.

Chall: Was the split over anything you can recall? Ideology?

Hosmer: Well, I remember it was a mess about the dues, and the members of the board and the other president--I can't even remember her name. I can see her. They took the dues and bought themselves lunches, and cocktails, and you know, that wasn't the thing to do, particularly in those days. [laughter]

Chall: So, it wasn't really an ideological split?

Hosmer: It wasn't ideological. No, no.

Chall: Just what they wanted to do?

Hosmer: They had control and they just kicked out the dissidents; there was quite a to-do about it. Gee, I don't even remember--that was some time ago.

Chall: Because the county is large and the population grew so, did it remain divided, or did you finally join forces?

Hosmer: No. Eventually, after I became president, what I did was to organize it town by town as much as I could, and I had over a thousand members; it's never been so large since.

Chall: In San Mateo County?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: My! Well!

Hosmer: Never had it since. But we did; we went in and we'd get a group of five or six women together. Then I'd go in and talk to them and tell them why it was needed and so on and so forth, and what they could do and what they could learn and how they could become part of selecting candidates and making decisions on issues. I've been fighting for women's rights to do that for a long time! [laughter]

And then the representative or the president whom they'd choose I'd put on my board. So, you see, throughout the county, you know, we had a lot of people--Daly City, South San Francisco, Burlingame, San Mateo, Menlo Park, Atherton, Woodside. The other people kind of feel apart after that came, because they were really using the group for their own entertainment, shall I say.

Chall: Yes, I see. Did you have a requirement as to the size of a group?

Hosmer: Usually we required a membership of ten people for being part of the federation.

Chall: That's small.

Hosmer: Yes. That's always been the requirement as far back as 19___. You don't have that many active members, you know, as a rule, to get a group started. Sometimes you have to go back four and five and six times. Then you had to go back and bolster them up. [chuckle]

Chall: That's a lot of work.

Well, at the time that you joined, what were the women doing in the federation? Were they there, as you were, because their husbands were interested in Republican politics and it was easier to belong to the women's group than the assembly, or was there another reason?

Hosmer: A lot of them came because they were really and truly interested in politics, and they wanted to know about issues, and they wanted to know about candidates, and they enjoyed coming together and meeting with other people. I started study groups on various things--on the Constitution, and on legislation, and things like that.

Hosmer: Even when I was vice-president with Mrs. Alexander, I got things going and I got people interested in things. I've always been able to do that pretty well, because I believe what I'm saying, you see, so it makes it simpler that way.

Chall: That's right. If they were interested in issues and politics, why wouldn't these women join the League of Women Voters instead of the Republican federation?

Hosmer: Because the League of Women Voters has always been considered to be extremely liberal and controlled by the unions. In fact, I used to go to the League of Women Voters in San Francisco when I was a businesswoman up there, and I used to be very upset with some of the positions they took, but I didn't understand why. And it wasn't until much later when I did a research job on them that I found out that they tended that way to a great extent. They are not partial by any manner or means.

Chall: Oh, you mean impartial.

Hosmer: Yes. [chuckle]

Chall: [laughter] We'd better get that straight!

Hosmer: Yes, they are not impartial by any manner or means, and just about all of their stances have always been way over, in the opinion of most Republicans, in left field, as they call it. So, that is the reason why they didn't belong to the voters.

Chall: I see. Even in this county where--

Hosmer: Oh, this has always been a very liberal county. We're close to San Francisco and we have an overflow down here.

Chall: It's a bedroom community.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: So that these women were really already dedicated Republican women. They knew where they stood with respect to issues.

Hosmer: Oh, yes. You had to be a member of the Republican party in order to become a member; you had to be a registered Republican. They didn't even allow--they only have speakers who are registered Republicans.

Chall: Yes, I see.

Hosmer: Because the Democrats don't give a platform to a Republican. You see, we were different. We were extremely different from the Democrats because we were under our own charter, our own constitution, our own by-laws, while the Democrat volunteer organization was under the Democratic central committee, you see.

Chall: Yes. Now, there are also vice-chairmen of the Republican State Central Committee who are women.

Hosmer: No, no, no. They are regional vice-presidents.

Chall: Regionals, but they're all women.

Hosmer: Well, that's true. Under the by-laws and constitution of the Republican State Central Committee--you see, California is so long and so big, we have three divisions: we have a southern division, we have a central division, we have a northern division. And it has become customary to make the vice-chairman--we have a state chairman from one end of the state and a state vice-chairman from the other end of the state who are both men. The chairmanship goes from one end of the state to the other; it alternates.

Chall: Yes, I guess that's required.

Hosmer: Yes, that's required under the law. And then the women's vice-chairman has always been a woman in these various divisions--the central, the southern, and the northern. Now, those women did most of the work [laughter], as usual, you know.

So, when a meeting was being held, the same thing applied in the divisions. We have three divisions in the Federation of Republican Women, so you've got a president from each one of the divisions. But if a state central committee meeting was being held in a division, then that vice-chairman of the state central committee helped to make the arrangements and handled the campaigns through the direction of the chairman. There's no change in that. Most of that's in the State Election Code, I believe.

Chall: The fact that women are the vice-chairmen--

Hosmer: But those are regional vice-chairmen. The real vice-chairman is the man; it just goes back. There's nothing that says a woman can't be--

Chall: The chairman?

Hosmer: Yes. But I refuse to vote for a woman just because she's a woman; I want her to be qualified. I mean, that's why I don't like the quota system that this ERA sets up.

Chall: Now, are the women who are the regional vice-chairmen of the central committee a different group of women from those in the federation?

Hosmer: Most of them were from the federation, or the California Republican Assembly, and then later on, UROC [United Republicans of California] --they come from the volunteer organizations.

In fact, that's why I became vice-chairman of the county central committee. I was president of the County Federation of Republican Women. So, when a vacancy occurred, I was appointed. Marjorie Benedict was adamant about getting women vice-chairmen in every county central committee because she figured more work would get done, and she really fought for that, and she fought to have them on the state central committee too. It's just when you got too prominent that she got worried about you. [tape off briefly]

Chall: I want to go back just a bit, since we're in this same time span, and pick up a couple of things before we go on. Did your husband win the 1946 election?

Hosmer: Yes, overwhelmingly.

Chall: I see. As a result of that, were there changes made in the school?

Hosmer: They got a new superintendent, and there were some changes made.

Chall: But getting a new superintendent in itself meant that some changes were made?

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: And his side of the board became the majority?

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: I see. Now, Mary Cereghino--was she a Republican?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And was she a member of the federation?

Hosmer: Later on, she became a member.

Chall: But she wasn't at that time?

Hosmer: No. I didn't know her at all then. She didn't know me, I didn't know her, at that time.

Chall: I see. At that time, you had already joined the San Mateo federation, however.

Hosmer: I became a member in '45.

Chall: So, in '46, through her, you became a precinct worker.

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: Now, then, it seems that in '46 you were elected secretary of the federation and, so, you must have been showing your talents already.

Hosmer: I guess so. [chuckle]

Women's Chairman for Assemblyman Richard Dolwig, 1946

Chall: And you also at that time, in that year, were appointed as women's chairman for Assemblyman Richard Dolwig's campaign.

Hosmer: Yes. Well, we had a fact-finding committee to select assemblymen that year.

Chall: Who are "we?"

Hosmer: The San Mateo County Central Committee set it up, and he was one of--oh, criminy!--four or five candidates, and he won out. He was a Republican, and I was his women's chairman.

On the fact-finding committee, you see, people from every town were represented on that.

Chall: The Republican leaders?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And so, as a result of your work with the federation, that gave you an "in" into this fact-finding committee.

Hosmer: Yes, that's right.

Chall: You were on the committee?

Hosmer: Yes, I was a member of the committee. So was Frank Ingersoll. Halley [James W.] wasn't active here at that time.

Chall: Were there others that you can remember who wanted to run for the assembly besides Dolwig?

Hosmer: The only other one that I can remember was Tom Callan. Was it Tom? He was the other who wanted to run at that time.

Chall: Why was there a need to pick somebody? There was no incumbent? Or was this a redistricting?

Hosmer: It was a new district. They were redistricting it and the assembly district included the whole county. You can see how small it was in those days.

Chall: Yes. And who was Richard Dolwig at the time?

Hosmer: He was an attorney and an ex-schoolteacher.

Chall: Oh, is that right?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: All right. Now, county women's chairman. . .

Hosmer: That was my responsibility, and I would do precinct work, and get people to support him, and make phone calls, and see that he got out to make speeches to women's groups and things like that throughout the county.

Chall: How much time did that take you?

Hosmer: Well, a lot of it was done on the phone; not all of it. But I always made a point to be home when my son got home from school. That was one of my rules.

Chall: Were you living in the old family home at that time?

Hosmer: No, we weren't living there until 1951. Merritt's mother was still alive. We lived a block away. Merritt was over every day to visit her. She was in her eighties.

Chall: As the women's chairman, were you also coordinating work with some of the men leaders?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. On the central committee. Yes, come to think of it, I was an associate member of the central committee at that time.

Chall: An associate member?

Hosmer: Yes. In other words, you could come and give reports and do work and [laughter] that was all.

Chall: But the members of the central committee--

Hosmer: --were elected.

Chall: Do you remember any of the men who were active in the central committee? Are there any who stand out in your mind?

Hosmer: I can't even remember who was chairman at that time.

Chall: Oh, I can probably dig that up for you. No, I don't have it going back that far [looking at notes]. I only go back as far as 1948. . . Rudolph A. Rapsey.

Hosmer: He was a judge later on. Who was next? Who was after him?

Chall: Enoch Richardson.

Hosmer: Oh, I knew him. He was the source of one big hassle. I don't know. I don't know. No, those men--I didn't know those men very well.

Chall: Then you were operating really with women primarily?

Hosmer: With the women.

Chall: This campaign was after the campaign that you conducted for your husband?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Because that would have been in April, wouldn't it?

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: So, you had gained some experience along the line.

Hosmer: Yes. A little bit.

Chall: Now, at the same time, there was an election going on for Governor Warren and Goodwin Knight.

Hosmer: I wasn't very much involved in that.

Chall: You weren't active?

Hosmer: No. I was too new at the state scene to have too much knowledge of any of those things. There was a Warren-Knight fight later on that we were involved in.

Chall: Yes.

Hosmer: That was in the fifties sometime.

- Chall: Now, in 1947, according to my votes, you were made program chairman of the county federation. Why were you appointed?
- Hosmer: Well, they just didn't have somebody to get programs, and so I got the job.
- Chall: Well, you must have had something in mind that you wanted to do, or were doing.
- Hosmer: Well, I think I was able to get people to come and speak.
- Chall: Oh, I see.
- Hosmer: You see, I was in a business and professional women's club--it's called the San Francisco Breakfast Women's Club--when I was in San Francisco, so I had a lot of contacts up there that made it possible for me to get some speakers to come in for our club meetings. And, of course, if you're going to attract new members and get some action, you're going to have to have good programs.
- Chall: I see. So, that takes care of 1947, and it's an off-election year too, so I suppose it's a breathing year.
- Hosmer: Yes.
- Chall: In 1948, now--I want to ask you a question about something I picked out of the newspaper. [San Mateo Times] This was in June of 1948. You were appointed campaign chairman for the Council of Republican Women by Mrs. Myrtle Clark Stearns, who was the president of the San Mateo chapter.
- Hosmer: That was the one we had the big hassle with.
- Chall: You were to be part of the campaign committee organized by all of the Republican organizations in San Mateo County by E.L. Richardson, the committee chairman. Every now and then I come across this name of "Council of Republican Women," and I wondered about it.
- Hosmer: That's what they used to call the federation. It used to be the California Council of Republican Women. It was organized as the California Council of Republican Women in 1938, and the various clubs throughout the state were called "Council." It wasn't till--gee, I think it was in the fifties that we changed it to the Federation of Republican Women.
- Chall: Yes, because I found this name all the time and I couldn't quite understand it. So, let's see now. You were appointed campaign chairman for the council. At the same time, you were also vice-president.

Hosmer: Yes. It was the San Mateo County Council of Republican Women, not Federation, in those days.

Chall: It was still a divided group?

Hosmer: It hadn't divided yet. I gave you the wrong timing there. I had forgotten. You see, I had forgotten. When you bring out some of this information and ask about my experiences, I gradually recall. I think that it was after 1948 that the group split. I can't remember whether it was '49 or '50 or when it was. Maybe when you bring up other things I can tie it in.*

Chall: All right. Now, she [Myrtle Clark Stearns] was president of the San Mateo chapter, which means that Miss Alexander--

Hosmer: Became--no, she didn't become president till we had the split.

Chall: Oh, Alexander became president after the split?

Hosmer: Yes, after the split, because we wanted a noncontroversial figure. I was one of the people who helped oust the other gal because she was not doing the job and she was using us for her own purposes.

Chall: That's Mrs. Clark Stearns?

Hosmer: Yes. And it was so funny because she was a Democrat up to the day that she was elected, and the gal who picked her to run for president took her down to change her registration so she could be president. And, of course, that just teed us off like nobody's business!

Chall: Well! What was going on?

Hosmer: She'd sold herself a bill of goods to Bessie Hayes, who was from San Francisco and who had written the bylaws and the constitution and things. Well, she didn't find out until after the woman was elected that she wasn't a registered Republican. [laughs] And Bessie was a stickler for what was proper, but she'd put her neck on the block, you know, so she took her down. It wasn't till years later that I learned about that.

Chall: And you didn't think that Mrs. Stearns was a capable president, regardless of her former party affiliation?

Hosmer: She was a very flamboyant type of person who was always, well, very dramatic, shall we say. But she wasn't the least bit interested in politics, so that she was just using it for herself and to make

*It was probably 1949. See page 57 for additional details.

Hosmer: herself important. But it was the use of the money and things to which we objected the most. We could never get any accounting, and then we'd have a meeting, and they'd all come slightly swacked to the meeting. [chuckle] It was kind of a hard thing for us more puritan types to take! [laughter]

Chall: [laughter] Now, E.L. Richardson was the--

Hosmer: Enoch L. Richardson was chairman of the County Central Committee for a number of years [1950-1952] and very dedicated. We didn't have much money or really much party in those days; we were sort of almost able to meet in a telephone booth, you know, as far as interest was concerned. But he used his equipment. He got desks for us and he got all that sort of thing.

Chall: For your campaign.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: That must have been 1948.

Hosmer: Yes. Wasn't that the Truman campaign?

Chall: Yes, it was.

Hosmer: Dewey and--oh, I remember that! I went up there and I told them they were nuts if they thought that Dewey was going to get in.

Chall: You went up where, and told whom? [laughter]

Hosmer: To the county central committee meeting, being naive and innocent and thinking that I carried a little weight.

Chall: Because you were vice-chairman and also campaign chairman of the--

Hosmer: No, I wasn't vice-chairman of the central committee.

Chall: No, the council.

Hosmer: Yes, and working in the precincts, and plus the fact that my husband said that anybody that looks like something on top of a wedding cake would never get in. [laughter] And then they were all, everybody, all the Republicans, were so sure that Dewey was going to be a shoo-in, and Merritt said, "Ridiculous!" [laughter]

Chall: Was this before Dewey was nominated? Did you go up and protest when you thought that perhaps he might be nominated by the Republican party?

Hosmer: I don't remember that. At that stage of the game, I wasn't involved in state or national politics at all. I was just an innocent little hardworking housewife who was concerned with what was going on in the world and trying to do something about it.

Chall: Well, now, let's see. There was a concern prior to the convention that maybe Robert Taft or Harold Stassen or Thomas Dewey--any of these people, and maybe there were others--might be nominated. I suspect that there were some people in California who supported each of these men.

Hosmer: The first knowledge that I knew of Taft or Stassen was in '52, not in '48. I was completely--I was just totally within the local county structure. It's hard to believe it, but I was. That was the one thing that I remember--how distressed I was, you know. These men were sitting quietly by [chuckle]--you can imagine what they were thinking. They weren't making any effort to go out and do anything because he was going to be a shoo-in, and I told them he wasn't a shoo-in. Nearly, I would say, about eighty percent of the party that year were people who believed that nothing needed to be done because he wasn't going to have any difficulty at all getting in.

Chall: So that there wasn't much of a campaign going on.

Hosmer: There was hardly any, and this is one of the things about which we were complaining, and that's what I went up to complain about to the central committee.

Chall: I see. In the meantime, you were also working again for Assemblyman Dolwig.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Was that a separate campaign?

Hosmer: Yes. I worked--every two years.

Chall: You worked for Dolwig?

Hosmer: Yes, I worked for him just about all the time he was running for office, except the last time.

Appointment to the Republican State Central Committee, 1948

Chall: This was the year--1948--that you were appointed for the first time, according to my records, to the Republican State Central Committee.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: You were appointed, I suppose, by Dolwig.

Hosmer: Yes. That was my first year on the state central committee.

Chall: Do you recall your reactions to the first meeting? I guess it was at that meeting that Edward Shattuck was appointed state chairman.

Hosmer: Edward Shattuck and Jane Shattuck.

Chall: That's his wife.

Hosmer: Yes, she was a lovely woman. Ed Shattuck [chuckle] looked enough like Earl Warren to be his twin brother, you know, with the white hair and all the rest of it. I worked with him on some of the bylaws and things. I liked him very much. I think he was a capable fellow. He was an attorney. He was a power in the party for years and years and years.

Chall: Do you have any recollections of the first central committee meeting?

Hosmer: I was probably awed, you know, because of the state level and everything else, and I was quite thrilled and excited to be there. But I didn't know much of what was going on; I didn't know the ramifications and the behind-the-scenes things that go on at a state central committee meeting. [chuckle] I was much too naive.

Chall: Well, you probably picked it up along the way.

Hosmer: Yes, I sure did! I learned, over the years, a lot of things.

Chall: So, you really came up through--

Hosmer: What you'd call, I guess--in Eastern Star--you'd call "the chairs," wouldn't you?

Chall: Yes.

Hosmer: Something like that.

Chall: You were coming up slowly.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: But obviously coming up. So, except for Dolwig and, I suppose, some other local people, the Republicans lost that election.

Hosmer: Yes. I don't even know who was running in the state at that time, come to think of it. I'd have to go back and check. What years was Warren governor? Do you remember?

Chall: He was governor from '42 to--he would have been through '56, except that he ended it in '53 when he was appointed to the Supreme Court. So, he started out in '42. And in this year--'48--he was running with Tom Dewey as the vice-presidential candidate.

Hosmer: That's right. I had forgotten that.

Committee to Elect Richard Nixon to the Senate, 1950

Chall: You were again on the state central committee. But this year you were also appointed to the San Mateo County Committee for the Election of Richard Nixon to the Senate.

Hosmer: Yes. It was above-the-county activity--the beginning of it.

Chall: Now, how did this appointment come about?

Hosmer: [pauses to think] Probably through Richardson, county central committee chairman. I think it must have, because, you see, that's really state--you know, county-state--politics.

Chall: I see. That's how appointments are made, locally.

Hosmer: Yes. You see, that would be party politics, so it must have been through E.L. Richardson.

Chall: Can you recall what you were to do on the committee and what you did do?

Hosmer: The same thing.

Chall: Just get out the vote?

Hosmer: Get out the vote, and do the precinct work, and do the telephoning, and see that the people got out and voted, and see that the material was sent out, and all that. It's the same nitty-gritty whatever candidate you're working for.

Chall: Well, then, the fact that you were put on this committee--was it considered an honor?

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: Was it an honorary thing, rather than that you would be expected to do a different type of work?

Hosmer: Well, anybody who did precinct work for one candidate was considered knowledgeable enough to do precinct work for another candidate. And, of course, that would have something to do with, if he came into the county, helping to get people at the meetings and the hearings and work like that.

Chall: Special meetings.

Hosmer: Special meetings and programs and things like that.

Chall: Can you give me your first impressions of Richard Nixon? Of course, he had been elected to the Congress in '46 and '48, but I suppose you didn't know him then, did you?

Hosmer: No, I didn't know him. He was our Republican candidate, you know, and I was still not as discerning in this--although I was quite impressed by him, with his ability to speak and what he had to say and things like that.

Chall: Did you meet him when he came into the county?

Hosmer: Oh, yes, because I was county chairman, you know. I met him and I met Pat.

Chall: Yes. Did you have any impressions of her?

##

Chall: You were telling me about Pat Nixon before we turned the tape over.

Hosmer: Well, she always amazed me in her ability to remember faces and names over the years. But she was always a very warm and friendly person. I always felt that she was very self-disciplined and controlled, which was fortunate for her over the years, you know, because there's nothing worse, there's nothing tougher, than being a politician's wife, I don't think.

Chall: I'm sure it's hard, yes.

And at the end of that period, Enoch Richardson was appointed county chairman.

Hosmer: Elected. You see, the county central committee is elected and they elect their chairman.

Chall: Yes. And T.H. DeLap was--

Hosmer: Tony DeLap.

Chall: Tony DeLap, is that it? He was elected state chairman.

Hosmer: Was he state chairman?

Chall: That's what I have in my notes.

Hosmer: [laughter] Oh, cripes! He was a funny little guy. H'd been in a-- I don't know whether he was an assemblyman or a senator.* You know, it was one of those things that I didn't know much about at the time, but they said he was one of the most knowledgeable politicians in the state of California for many, many years. But I didn't have that much contact with him. I didn't know much about him.

Chall: There is a picture of you in 1951 in the San Mateo Times of November 7, showing you and Senator Knowland and Harry C. Miner.

Hosmer: Yes. Harry Miner was a member of the county central committee, and Bill Knowland came down. He was United States Senator at the time and he came down and gave a talk, and I was in the picture I guess because of my job.

Chall: This is probably an error, then, when the article says that you were vice-president of the Republican Assembly of San Mateo County. You were not vice-president of the assembly, were you, but of the council?

Hosmer: Probably, yes.

Chall: Were you still active in the assembly?

Hosmer: Well, while Harold Putnam was out here Merritt and I used to go to some of the meetings, but I don't think I was--

Chall: You didn't have an office, did you?

Hosmer: I don't remember that I had an office at that time.

Chall: So, that probably meant--

*Member of the assembly, 1935-1937; of the state senate, 1937-1948.

- Hosmer: That probably meant the Council of Republican Women, I think. I wouldn't want to swear to it. I can't remember that. I haven't even thought of that for so many years.
- Chall: Yes. Well, that's a mystery. But because you were vice-president of the council--
- Hosmer: I'd say it was the federation, or the council, at that time. Gee, my sins are finding me out, aren't they? [chuckle] All the way back there.
- Chall: I have your career pretty well taken from the material that you gave me, but I find little things in newspaper clippings.
- Hosmer: I can believe it.

President, San Mateo County Federation [Council] of Republican Women, 1952-1956

- Chall: Now we come to 1952, which seems to be a year in which you were rising politically. In this year you became president of the San Mateo County--
- Hosmer: Council.
- Chall: Council of Republican Women still, yes. That post you held for four years.
- Hosmer: Yes.
- Chall: Was that a smooth election?
- Hosmer: That was at the time that we had the--Annette Alexander decided that after four years she'd had it. But we had rules in our bylaws that you could serve two terms, and they're two-year terms.
- Chall: Oh, are they? Oh, just two-year terms?
- Hosmer: Yes. Because we want to have a smooth transition and have a person in a non-election year who would be able to follow through in the election year, you see. That was the thinking behind that.

So, Annette had been in for her four years, so that's how come I got in. There wasn't any competition. And between the other time and the '52, we had our hassle and the thing had gone down to eighteen members and then I built it up to a thousand.

Chall: My! Eighteen members in your northern group?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And you built it up in those four years to a thousand members?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: In the northern part of the county?

Hosmer: All over the county. The other section kind of went down the drain.

Chall: I see. Now, that must have taken a great deal of time. Did you have competent help from your vice-president and the secretary, do you recall? Of course, from eighteen people there wasn't much of a choice.

Hosmer: Mary Cereghino came in and worked with me. I can't even remember who the vice-president was. Jean Orr was in the group. Hilde Rooth, who's vice-chairman of the county central committee today was in the group. She's a German girl who married a colonel and came over here. I groomed both of those girls to come after me. I always was looking for people that could come up through the chairs, so to speak. And there was a--what the heck was her name? Charles? Charlotte? I can't even think of it.

But we raised money so we could print materials so we could, you know, develop this program. Isn't that funny? I can't remember that gal who just worked her head off on that.

Chall: Develop what program?

Hosmer: To bring in new members. To get people alerted to the fact they had a Republican women's group here.

Principle of Fairness: A Motivating Philosophy

Chall: Being president gave you more access to the--was it the state level or the Northern California level of the federation?

Hosmer: Northern California. But I had been appointed Americanism chairman in Northern California before I became county president, I think.

But back in '48--we'll have to go back there a minute. Back in 1948, I went to my first northern division convention and Ardis Myhrs ran for president at that time. She's in Berkeley. She was a

Hosmer: schoolteacher. And I went up there and they had some fancy footwork going on where they had a candidate for president of the northern division, and the president introduced one candidate and didn't introduce Ardis. I objected to that; it was against all my ideas of fairness, and I just said, "If she's had this time given her, it's only fair to have Ardis Myhrs be given equal time."

So, they did it most ungraciously, but it was a stacked election, stacked--oh, it was a terrible situation.

But two years later, in 1950, Ardis became president and she never forgot the fact that I had stood up and fought for what I considered to be a principle of fairness.

You see, my whole philosophy of politics has always been on the basis of fairness and on the basis of principles, and I believed that the party, wherever it was, should use the principles of constitutional government all the way down the line to local affairs. Sometimes I have been highly criticized for being pigheaded and other times I have been highly complimented. I remember going before the League of Women Voters when a very vituperative letter--oh, it was during the Nixon campaign in '52, I guess.

Chall: When he was running as vice-president?

Hosmer: Yes. And the request for a speaker came to me, on the basis of what your party stands for, what your candidate stands for, and so I did my speech completely on the basis of the principles and the standards and, you know, what we believe. I can't even remember the name of the Democrat National Committee woman at the time.

Chall: That was Clara Shirpser.

Hosmer: That's it. Yes, that's right. But I never saw such a vituperative attack on people in my life as the one she presented. And I just grabbed a microphone and said I had not been told that this was the way it was going to be done. She didn't even come; she had it read by somebody else, you see. She even went back before Hoover, attacking all the Republican candidates. I objected, and I said this was directly contrary to what I was told it was going to be. Then I gave my talk and brought it out away from personalities to people. I got a standing ovation from the League of Women Voters, and Mrs. Martin Dinkelspiel and Mrs. John Dinkelspiel. All of those people were so impressed with the way I handled the situation and they were horrified at the other presentation. Wasn't Shirpser the one called the "dragon lady?"

Chall: No, that's Carmen Warschaw.

Hosmer: Oh, yes, she was later. She was later, yes. I guess that's right. But I never did meet her. She never would meet me. You see, I had a pretty good reputation even then as a speaker. Of course, you see, what I did, what I always do in anything in politics--issues or what have you--I research it and document it, but I do try to keep away from personalities.

In one of my real liberal battles with one gal within the Republican party, she said she just couldn't understand me. She said I would stand up and make these fights, but then I'd demand that the other fellow have equal time. And they couldn't understand it, you see, but this has been the basis of my activities all my life. I think the highest compliment I was paid was at a state convention of about three thousand women in Southern California--oh, three or four years ago, I guess it was--where they said they may not always agree with me, but they knew I was honest and sincere in what I was saying and I usually had documentation for what I said. I thought that was the highest compliment I could be paid after all the years I was involved in politics. This is really and truly the way I have tried to operate, but that doesn't mean I haven't made enemies, because you're bound to, you know, when you take stands on anything; you're damned if you do, and you're damned if you don't. I realize that when you're in a position of leadership, you are going to run into that, so that it doesn't bother me.

Chall: It doesn't bother you?

Hosmer: Not any more. It did at first. It used to upset me terribly when people would attack me unfairly, I thought, when I was trying to be fair. But I learned, you know, and I've tried to do what was the right thing as far as I saw it, and I always have granted the other fellow the right to his own opinion. Freedom of conscience is something I believe in very, very strongly. So, it's one of those things. But, anyhow, that was just an aside. I got along well with those people. I used to disagree strongly with some of John Dinkelspiel and more of Clara's--Dinkelspiel. They're not related really.

Chall: No, I don't know the family. I just know the name and I know that John was chairman of the county committee.

Hosmer: Yes. We got along fine when he was chairman. They used to get awfully mad at me because I wouldn't compromise on some things.

Chall: Well, at least they would know where you were standing.

Hosmer: They sure did! [laughs] I wasn't really belligerent about it; I tried not to be. I think I'm not belligerent now, but I speak with more authority because of the years of experience behind me, plus the fact of my experience on the parole board. [Women's Board of

Hosmer: Terms and Parole] I know my son says, "Mom, you come on too strong," and it's because of that experience. When you're dealing with people of that type, you get. . . You have to learn to soften your approach to things.

Chall: During this period--I don't know whether it applies yet--as you were gaining more experience and more certainty about where you stood, did you find that you would have difficulty with men in the party leadership?

Hosmer: Never. I always have gotten along very well with men. I wasn't out to compete with them, you see; I wasn't competing with men. Maybe there were times when I tried to instruct them and teach them something; sometimes they listened, and sometimes they didn't. But what made me an influence with men was the work that I did. They could depend on me. They couldn't ignore me because of the work I did at the precinct level, and the work I was doing throughout the county. Then when I got in the state level, northern division level, I was an influence. I'd go up and challenge them on issues and on legislation, and when they found out I knew what I was talking about, you know. . . I have been told that women ought to stay home and stay in the kitchen at different times. [laughter]

Chall: They were kidding you.

Hosmer: That's right. Locally--well, there were exceptions; there's always a certain one. On the county committee, there was a man on there. This couple had started in politics the same time I did, and they always resented it bitterly that I went ahead to the state and national level and they didn't. I don't want to get involved in it because they're still here in the area. She was the one that was very vicious, you know, but it was just sheer jealousy. So, I'd try to ignore it on that basis. And then, of course, when I was for Goldwater, they would be for Rockefeller. So philosophically we were as far apart as the poles. It was just as simple as that.

Chall: You said something a little while ago about being Americanism chairman of the northern division, you thought, before you became president.

Hosmer: Well, maybe I wasn't.

Chall: You were Americanism chairman, according to your own list here, from 1954 to 1956, although I have a clipping dated February 26, 1953 regarding your appointment. So that was during the time you were president, after you'd been president for about two years.

Hosmer: Yes, that's it. Yes, that was it. And then I was state Americanism chairman after that [1958-1960], and then national Americanism chairman [1963-1965].

Chall: Now, to continue to get down your early career dates, you were elected president of the San Mateo County Council of Republican Women in 1952.

Hosmer: I was involved in the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign, wasn't I?

Chall: Yes, you were. When, by the way, are the elections in the federation? Are they early in the year so that you are set to go for the campaign?

Hosmer: Generally, they're elected in December, November and December of the--

Chall: Preceding year.

Hosmer: The non-election year.

Chall: I see. So that by the time the election campaigns come along in maybe January and February, the beginnings of the planning, you're already set to go, as you said earlier.

Hosmer: Yes. We are going to install a new slate of officers for next year, either next week, or this week. Where am I? [chuckle]

Chall: This is December. Now, in 1952 you were appointed, for the first time, San Mateo County precinct chairman. I guess they figured you'd had enough experience.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Ordinarily would the president of the local council (now the federation), be as active in the campaign as you were? Would it be necessary that she be that well organized and ready to undertake a major political assignment?

Hosmer: Well, the Federation of Republican Women does not pre-primary endorse, but we can do precinct work.

Chall: In the primary?

Hosmer: In the primary, and get the Republican vote out without taking any part for a candidate's race. Now, you see, when we had some of these elections, there was no opposition candidate, which makes a difference.

Chall: Yes, that makes it easier.

Hosmer: Yes. But it was the women's group that did all the precinct work.

Chall: The central committee would raise the money primarily?

Hosmer: Supposedly.

Chall: But you also raised a lot of money?

Hosmer: Well, we contributed toward it. I was always against it.

Chall: How did you do that?

Hosmer: Well, we'd have luncheons and charge extra, and we'd have white elephant sales, and things like that. But that wasn't our primary purpose; our primary purpose was education and precinct work, assisting them and getting the vote out, primarily.

Chall: And in the educational field, that was left to the program chairman primarily?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Let's see, I saw a few bulletins that Mrs. [Barbara] Stidham showed me, which indicated that you have a pretty wide range of issues and concerns that each local group can pick out for itself.*

Hosmer: Oh, yes. We had local autonomy. Oh, yes. Absolutely. Each local club has its own program chairman, has its own educational program, and what they do within their own county in assisting the county central committee is up to them. There are certain limits in our constitution and bylaws as to what they can do and can't do. We don't allow our lists to be given to candidates or anything like that, because those are membership. And, as I say, we are supposed to remain neutral in the primary. If you're an officer--the state president, county president, local president, you know, are supposed to remain neutral in the primary.

Chall: And the organization itself has to remain neutral.

Hosmer: We do not endorse, you see. The Republican Assembly and the UROC--the United Republicans of California--pre-primary endorse, but the women's groups do not.

Chall: I understand there was a move on to allow pre-primary endorsements recently.

Hosmer: Yes, at the convention, yes.

*Mrs. Stidham, Northern Division president, 1976-1977, provided background information on the California Federation of Republican Women.

Chall: Are you opposed to it yourself? I mean, what's your stand on the pre-primary endorsement?

Hosmer: Well, I have always felt that we had enough Republican organizations making pre-primary endorsements, and since our primary purpose was education and precinct work that the only way you can do a proper job is to not make pre-primary endorsements. It's kind of hard at times.

Chall: Yes, I'm sure. The membership, the women who are not officers, can--

Hosmer: As individuals.

Chall: As individuals, work for their own candidates during the primary?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. But they can't use the name of the organization.

Chall: I suppose that during the year or so of the heavy part of the campaigning, you weren't going out organizing new groups.

Hosmer: Oh, no. During the campaign you usually get new members just because you have publicity in the papers and notices of what's going on and the activities and things. So, there's not too much problem in getting them. It's the off-election years that are hard.

Chall: Yes, to keep them together.

Hosmer: Yes, to keep them going.

Chall: 1952 was an important year for you as the president.

You were precinct chairman and also you were the county women's chairman for the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: But I want to talk to you first about the campaign for a congressional candidate. As I understand it, there was another redistricting.

The Campaign of J. Arthur Younger, 1952

Hosmer: [laughs] Oh, we had another fact-finding; that's the last fact-finding committee we've ever had in the county, and it was a knockdown-dragout fight between Congressman [J. Arthur] Younger and Al Sagehorn. What happened was that they ousted Richardson from the county central committee because he wouldn't go along with Younger, but, you see,

Hosmer: nobody knew who Younger was, where he came from. He never had any activities in the county. He came on very strong and a lot of people felt that the committee was loaded in his benefit, you know, to his side, and it was by manipulation.

I really don't know all of the problems involved, but Merritt and Al Sagehorn had worked together on the county central committee, and Sagehorn has been treasurer of the county.

Chall: Was your husband on the county central committee?

Hosmer: No, he never was.

Chall: Oh, I see. And Sagehorn had been?

Hosmer: No, I don't mean--I meant the San Carlos Council. I'm glad you caught me on that.

Chall: All right.

Hosmer: He'd been on the San Carlos council. He'd been treasurer of the county for years and done a fantastic job for the county.

Chall: This is Sagehorn?

Hosmer: This is Al Sagehorn. And Merritt was behind him, you know. Well, everybody who knew him liked him and respected him and admired him.

Chall: He was well known in the area, then, in the community.

Hosmer: I have to be very careful what I say about him because his widow is still alive and so is Mr. Younger's widow, and I'm very good friends with both of them.

Chall: Yes. Well, you can probably tell me what's relevant to know.

Hosmer: But Al didn't have any personality--you know. He just didn't project himself at all. And there was a lot of bitterness and hostility and ill feeling where Younger was concerned. For years he never forgave me for not being for him from the beginning. Merritt had a lot of respect and admiration for Art Younger as a businessman, but neither one of us thought he had a Chinaman's chance to get elected.

Chall: Why was that?

Hosmer: Because he wasn't known. Nobody--you see, he came in cold.

Chall: And he was a businessman?

Hosmer: He was a businessman, yes. He was in the savings and loan business. I think he'd been with the FHA at one time. I don't remember. But he was a dynamic person and a tremendous speaker, and we were highly impressed with him, but we didn't think he had a prayer.

Then there was Skip Athearn's mother--you know, the attorney--who ran for Congress at that time, a very sharp and very capable gal.

Chall: Did she try to get the--?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. The endorsement for Congress too. She was running.

Chall: What was her name?

Hosmer: Isn't that funny. [tries to recall name]

Chall: Well, we'll pick it up later.

Hosmer: Mrs. Gordon Athearn--no, that wasn't the name she went by.* They neglected to tell us she'd been divorced three or four times, and, you know, in those days that didn't go over. Oh, she was the smartest one of the bunch, really; I mean, as far as her presentation was concerned, she was. But she kind of could turn an awful lot of people off.

Chall: Let's see. Had she been active in Republican circles too?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: So, everybody was getting a chance at that time.

Hosmer: Everybody was. It was an open fact-finding committee to select a candidate. They'd call it a fact-finding committee.

Chall: But it was made up of anybody who was a Republican and wanted to come in and listen.

Hosmer: That's right, yes, just about.

Chall: So, it could have been stacked.

Hosmer: Oh, yes, very easily. There was never any proof of it, but there was a lot of feeling about it, and there was a lot of hard feeling. I remember the morning after the election, I called up Art Younger and told him I'd do everything I could to help him get elected.

Chall: That was after the primary?

* Mrs. Forden (Lucille) Athearn. (M.C.)

Hosmer: After the primary. And I worked with Bud Bostwick on that. He was head of the San Mateo County Development Association. He was amazed; he thought I'd do everything I could to give Art a bad time, you know, as a candidate. But Merritt was very impressed with his knowledge and his ability, but he did have that other loyalty, and I was lucky at the time. I was . . .

Chall: You were president, so you couldn't do anything. [laughter]

Hosmer: I was president [laughter], so I could sort of get out, but I did not come out and support him, and he never really quite forgave me for that.

Chall: I see. But you couldn't have come out in support of him, could you?

Hosmer: Well, he felt that I could have helped in other ways.

Chall: Your husband could have done it?

Hosmer: Merritt could have done it. And Merritt couldn't have done it, not with Al in the picture. So, it was just one of those situations that was too bad. Norma and I are extremely good friends; that's Art Younger's widow. And so is Al Sagehorn's wife, Gertrude. She's been in San Carlos for years and years. But, you know, you forget about things like that. But, oh, and they forced Richardson's resignation.

Chall: You mean just right then and there?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Not from the central committee, but from--

Hosmer: From the central committee.

Chall: From the central committee?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Over this issue?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Who forced it?

Hosmer: Because he didn't support Younger, and when Younger won, he wanted him out. So, the other members of the central committee, including Frank Ingersoll, made him get out.

Chall: Is that right?

Hosmer: Yes. So, eventually Rich and his wife Mary moved up to Sonoma County and stayed up there. It was really an awful blow to Rich because he'd spent years doing everything for the county central committee when, you know, there wasn't much support for Republicans in the county.

Chall: If the people elect members of the central committee, how can a group of--

Hosmer: They threw him out as chairman.

Chall: They threw him out as chairman? They could do that?

Hosmer: Yes, they could do that. They couldn't make him resign from the central committee. I'm sorry; I didn't mean to mislead you.

Chall: Okay. I just wanted to be sure that I understand what was really happening.

Hosmer: You see, he was elected as county chairman by the members of the committee, so they could oust him as chairman, and he wouldn't take it, naturally, which I can understand.

Chall: And he wouldn't run again?

Hosmer: Oh, he could have run again.

Chall: For the committee? Did he?

Hosmer: No, he just bowed out, and they went up to Sonoma.

Chall: I see. So, Younger really--although he came in with what looked like no support whatsoever, he must have had a lot of support.

Hosmer: He had very heavy support finance-wise. But he was a personable person. But he wasn't conservative enough for me.

Chall: I see. Even at that time.

Hosmer: Every time I went back to Washington and saw him, we used to get into big battles and hassles. He finally came over a lot more when he learned more about the structure and things like that, but he didn't know anything about the political. So, this is one of the things that I have had to contend with over the years, of people coming to me, wanting to run for office; they have no principles, they have no platform, they have no goals, they have no purposes. You know, they just want to run.

Chall: Yes. And you're a strong issue person.

Hosmer: Oh, yes. I am. I believe in issues and I believe in the Constitution and I think if we allow it to go down the drain we, as individuals, will suffer and be destroyed.

You might like to know when I get involved in problems and arguments on religion, I just say--I did this the other night--I said, "Don't ever attack anybody else's religion." I said, "We were based on that freedom of conscience, freedom of religion. If you allow some other religion to be attacked, you open your own souls up to the same attack. So, don't do it!" I said, "That's the great thing about America. We really believe in freedom of religion. But that doesn't mean that somebody else has a right to try to destroy our religion." So, I said, "Don't allow anybody to attack another religion."

Chall: That is a good principle.

Hosmer: Well, it is one that I [laughs] have really fought for at times, you know. And when I talk to church groups, you know, they want to be [gestures by pounding on table]. I get tired of being told I'm going to go to hell if I don't accept their doctrines, you know! [laughter] That's what made a Biblicist out of me! [laughter]

Chall: Well, that takes care of Mr. Younger's first campaign.

Hosmer: Yes. But he did have a very fine record and he did a good job back there. He didn't have any problem getting reelected. He covered this county like an umbrella; that's the only way I can say. He never missed making contact, and he had a tremendously excellent PR man; that was George McQueen. He used to be one of the editors of the Burlingame Advance, and George is one of the best PR men I have ever known and one with more political savvy than anybody I've ever known. He really was smart; he took care of the county for the congressman and he did an outstanding job.

Chall: There was also in that same year a campaign for the president, and there was quite a problem apparently in the state with respect to the Warren delegation, which was pledged to him as a favorite son, and a delegation for Thomas Werdel, which was pledged, as they say in quotes, as a "free GOP ticket." The Warren group claimed that it was basically a Taft ticket and an anti-Warren ticket made up of old-guard, disgruntled Republican factions who were opposed to the liberals.

Hosmer: [laughs heartily]

Chall: [laughter] I'm just taking it off the public record.

Hosmer: That sounds familiar! [laughter] I mean, I heard that before in so many other campaigns.

Chall: I'm taking it off the campaign and the primary campaign material.

Hosmer: [laughter] There's always a "disgruntled faction."

Chall: Did you go along with Werdel?

Hosmer: No. The first time I ever even got inside of a convention was in '56 when I was--what did they call them?--sergeant at arms, you know, just kind of an honorary thing because of my position. But, no, at that time--no. I knew where my husband stood.

Chall: Where did he stand?

Hosmer: He was for Taft, period. But I don't know; I don't think he had any use for Werdel, as I remember. We all had very grave doubts about what Werdel was up to.

Chall: What were your doubts?

Hosmer: We didn't know, you see. We didn't know what his motives were, whether he was truly a Taft man or not.

Chall: Your husband, I take it then, was a conservative Republican.

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: And you and he did not disagree on those matters.

Hosmer: No. We had no problems on that basis at all. Well, we usually talked things over. We talked things over politically, as we talked everything over. We were fortunately able to--what they call communicate today. [chuckle] That's such a funny thing. [laughter] Slightly overdone, I'd say.

But I wasn't involved in the Werdel/Warren thing. I wasn't too enthusiastic about Warren; I never have been.

Chall: Why was that?

Hosmer: I thought he was way up there on the ego scale, and I thought he was extremely liberal, and he proved that when he got on the court. And, of course, you know, going way back in history, they never, never found out why his father was murdered.

Chall: No, they haven't.

Hosmer: And there was a lot of speculation at that time. I was too young to know about that, but Merritt remembered much of the rumors and stories about it, and stories about what his father was and what he

Hosmer: was involved in. But I have no data and I have no documentation, so I wouldn't want to comment. But in any reports on Warren, I've never heard or seen anything, and, of course, he shushed it up. He was the DA at the time of the murder in Alameda County, and that was hushed up but good.

Chall: Your work, then, in the 1952 campaign was women's chairman for Eisenhower-Nixon.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And the same with respect to the Dolwig campaign.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: So, you were precinct chairman for the Republicans; that's what you were.

Hosmer: Yes. I became county precinct chairman for the whole county.

Other Issues, 1952

Chall: In that same year, in 1952, there was a ballot proposition--there were two of them--to abolish crossfiling. One was to abolish crossfiling per se, and the other one was just to list the party affiliation, which was the one that won. I came across a little bulletin of the Commonwealth Club in that year, and Mildred Prince spoke briefly against the abolition of crossfiling. I was wondering where you stood on crossfiling.

Hosmer: I was for the abolishment of it.

Chall: Had you always been for that?

Hosmer: Well, my dad fought it when Hiram Johnson introduced crossfiling when my father was in the state legislature. Dad was always opposed to it, and I guess I got that from him. I can remember Dolwig and I were at cross purposes on that, because I said that it absolutely destroyed party control, the crossfiling, that they took no stand on party principles--the Democratic principles or the Republican principles--and that I was opposed to it for those reasons. And I always had been opposed to crossfiling on that basis. So, I was hoping it would be abolished. I have no objection to identifying them by labels, you know, "D" and "R," but I felt the other way was completely dishonest.

Chall: Now, since Mildred Prince was a fairly active Republican in the San Francisco area, did you know Mildred Prince?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. I knew Mildred Prince.

Chall: I must confess I haven't read her little article yet.

Hosmer: I'd be interested to read it.

Chall: Yes, I'll bring it with me. Was there a stand that the federation or the council at that time took on crossfiling, or would it have been a local thing?

Hosmer: You know, I can't tell you that. I really don't know. Mildred Prince was more involved with Pro America. I'm trying to think. She was never considered--she was never a member of the federation. She was a member of Pro America, which was established by Mrs. Teddy Roosevelt and Mrs. Calvin Coolidge and those people back in '37, up in Washington, the state of Washington, and that's a bipartisan group. They were far to the right of the Republican party in most instances. But it invites Democrats and Republicans alike.

I became a member of it many years ago because I liked the materials that they sent out. But when I went down South as an officer of Pro America, I found the Democrats were way far to the right of our Republicans out here in California, and they're extremely extreme in many areas.

You know, I believe in being a conservative and things, but I think you have to have some common sense and good judgement in connection with it. When you go off the deep end, you lose your influence and your ability to convince anybody of anything.

Chall: Are you an officer in Pro America now?

Hosmer: Well, I'm Northern California Chapter president of Pro America.

Chall: So, you stayed with it.

Hosmer: No, I didn't stay with it. I didn't do anything in it. I paid my dues and came to the meetings until after I went out as state president of the Republican women. I didn't feel at the time that I . . . I wanted to keep active, but I didn't want to be a past president breathing down everybody's necks, you know. I've seen so much of that and I've experienced a little of it. I wanted to keep active and keep aware of these things. I go to the division meetings once in a while, but to be active I . . . That's only been in the last. . . I was national vice-president of Pro America for four years, but I wasn't conservative enough for them. [laughs]

Chall: Is that right?

Hosmer: Yes!

Chall: So, it's really a very conservative organization. Are you attempting in any way to change their way of looking at things?

Hosmer: No. I've got too many other things to do.

Chall: Well, it's interesting. [laughter] A change for you!

Hosmer: [laughter] It is a change. I even had a woman run against me for the county committee on the basis that I used to be a good conservative, but I'd changed. She went to the newspapers and they just laughed her out of the place! [laughter; tape off briefly]

Where are we now?

Chall: We were finishing 1952. At the end of that year, Frank Ingersoll was elected county chairman, and Laughlin Waters state chairman.

Hosmer: Laughlin Waters, yes. I didn't know him. I met him, you know, but I didn't know him.

Chall: And then that was the year that Thomas Kuchel was appointed to the Senate to replace Richard Nixon.

Hosmer: By Warren.

Chall: By Warren. Those were some of the major events that you might have been aware of.

And then I picked up in the newspaper of February 26, 1953-- that you were appointed Americanization--

Hosmer: Americanism, not Americanization.

Chall: Americanism chairman for the northern division by Mrs. Gladys L. Penland of Berkeley, who was president of the northern division at that time. So, that's when you began to work as Americanism chairman.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Now, in that same year, in June of 1953, you were appointed to a vacancy on the San Mateo County Central Committee, I guess to replace Harry Miner.

Hosmer: Yes. He resigned and moved out of the county.

Chall: I see. As I understand it, you were the second woman on that central committee. [San Mateo Times, June 16, 1953]

Hosmer: Second woman?

Chall: Yes. You were one of two women on that committee, according to that newspaper account.

Hosmer: Yes. I can't even think who the other one was. Gee, that's funny.

Chall: And let's see. You went on in June, and in December of that year, just six months later, you were elected vice-president.

Hosmer: Vice-chairman.

Chall: Vice-chairman, excuse me.

Hosmer: Yes, not president. On the committees, the party committees, they're always chairman and vice-chairman.

Chall: This, according to the newspaper, was "the first time in the history of San Mateo County that a woman was put in the post of second-in-command."

Hosmer: Yes. Twenty-two men and two women was quite--[laughter]

Chall: Now, there's really no reason why other women couldn't have been on that committee had they chosen to run and been elected.

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: That's always a difficult problem because nobody ever knows who's running for the committee.

Hosmer: Nobody has any idea.

Chall: It appears on your ballot and you wonder, "Who are these people?"

Hosmer: Who the heck they are, yes.

Chall: So, the fact that there aren't many women has no reflection on the process.

Hosmer: Oh, no. It was always open to them if they wanted to run.

Chall: Have you any idea why not many women would run at that time?

Hosmer: Well, it just wasn't the place--

Chall: I mean, you never did it.

Hosmer: No, I hadn't done it.

Chall: Had you ever thought of doing it?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: And yet you had been aware and working with the county committee for a number of years.

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: Any reason why you never thought of doing it?

Hosmer: Well, I was just used to having the men do it.

Chall: I see.

Hosmer: I think that was really, you know, my generation.

Chall: Yes. And you had enough activity and prestige with your council.

Hosmer: There were activities and I was working with other people, sure.

Chall: If the Republican women hadn't been as well organized as they were, would there have been, do you think, a desire on the part of active Republican women like yourself to get into the more formal political party structure.

Hosmer: I doubt it. Marjorie Benedict was always pushing us to run, you know.

Chall: Oh, she was?

Hosmer: Yes.

The Structure of the California Federation of Republican Women ##

[Interview 3: August 6, 1976]

Chall: The last time that I was here, you had been elected president. So, I assume that 1954 to 1956 is your second term as president of the San Mateo County Federation of Republican Women.

Hosmer: Yes, that's right.

Chall: Did that automatically put you on the Northern Division board?

Hosmer: Yes. It's a different setup from some of the things. The Northern Division Executive Board was made up of all the presidents of all the chapters throughout the Northern California area. This is the way it used to be; it's not this way any more. The executive committee was made up of the elected officers and standing committee chairmen. So, you see, you had one vote in one place and one vote in the other place. So, I was Americanism chairman as well, which made me a member of the executive committee.

There has been a change in the structure now. The chairmen are invited to the executive committee meetings, but the executive committee is only made up of the elected officers, and they appoint a parliamentary and correspondence secretary. So, it is a little bit different.

Chall: Yes. And what about all the chapter presidents? Are they automatically--?

Hosmer: They are all members of the board.

Chall: But the executive committee is different?

Hosmer: Well, but they don't have that. The executive committee meets prior to the regular meeting of the Northern Division, maybe the night before or the morning before or something. Then all the voting body is the division, which includes all of the presidents.

Chall: Yes. Does the executive committee meet at other times and take up--?

Hosmer: If it's needed.

Chall: Oh, I see. So, really it's the entire Northern Division that sets the policy?

Hosmer: Yes, that the executive committee recommends. But it does conduct business that needs to be conducted, like getting out newsletters, recommending legislation, and things like that.

Chall: The committee does that?

Hosmer: You see, on the executive committee, beside the president and the first two vice-presidents, there are regional vice-presidents. Do you know about them?

Chall: No. I'd like to.

Hosmer: Then I'll get you a roster. [goes to find roster]

Chall: Oh, I don't want to make you get up.

Hosmer: It's all right. I've got to get up. I've got to move. Just remind me to take it easy when I start getting up! [laughter; brief break while Mrs. Hosmer searches for roster and then returns]

You've not seen one of the rosters? You see, here's your state of California. [pointing to roster] There's your Northern Division, your Central Division, and your Southern Division.

Chall: I see. Has it always had a Central Division?

Hosmer: Yes. Then, you see, you have a vice-president from the North; now, that's Mrs. [Jackie] Ferre from Walnut Creek. She's a really great gal. And one's from the South, and one from Central.

Now, these are the boundaries for the northern: that's from Monterey to the Oregon border, from Humboldt County over to the Nevada line. And, you see, they go up to, but not including, Sacramento. It goes up like that. [showing map of boundaries of CFRW]

Now, your Central Division. I think it's much easier, and you can see that. I guess they include Sacramento now; they didn't used to. They change, you see, and I don't pay an awful lot of attention. But I think central includes, then, these counties in through there [pointing to map in roster], and each of them has their own setup. They have their own president, vice-president, regional vice-president, you see.

Now, a regional vice-president is responsible for membership and any help that is needed within the counties she represents. So, Region One is those three counties. [pointing to map] Region Two. Now, they're all members of the executive committee; you see, they're added to the membership secretary and so on.

Then, your southern. They do it a little differently. They have it like that, their elected officers. Then as part of their board and standing committees, you see, they have all of these people. They have--oh, crimeny! What is it? Twenty-nine counties down there? Wait a second. Here they are, here.

Chall: Fewer.

Hosmer: Sixty-five percent of all the population, you see, is in those eight counties. But each one has a county president. In other words, instead of having the regional president, and vice-presidents, they have county presidents.

Hosmer: See, now, Los Angeles County has its own meeting, its own officers. Imperial County has its own board, because they're so huge. There are--what is it?--116 or something clubs in Los Angeles County alone.

Chall: That's quite a bit of work there to being the president in that county.

Hosmer: I'll say there is. It's a big job. Los Angeles County alone is the equivalent of what I had as the president of the Northern Division, which was sixteen counties and 16,000 members, and they had 20,000 or 25,000 members in Los Angeles County alone. So, you see, that's where it helps to. . . I'll just leave that [roster] there in case there are any other questions that come up.

Chall: Yes. I have some questions, and maybe I can just borrow that for a while. I wanted to get the names of all the presidents.

Hosmer: You mean the past presidents?

I was automatically on the Northern Division board as president of the county. [reading from outline] Was I compatible with Gladys Penland? Oh, yes.

Gladys Penland was one of my strongest supporters and sponsors. She was a very capable gal. She wasn't terribly popular with some of them [chuckle], but Gladys was the kind of a person--she was a businesswoman. She had an insurance business and her son, when he came back from the service, ran it. Gladys was the kind of a person that if somebody came into the insurance office and there was trouble, she would sit down and have a cup of tea and a cookie with them, you know. [chuckle] She was a true diplomat. But she was a really hard working, dedicated person and she was a very dedicated American, and I think that's where we found our basis.

But when the prior president ran, she was a retired schoolteacher, Ardis Myhrs. Have you met her or talked to her?

Chall: No, I haven't.

Hosmer: Oh, you should see her. She's in Berkeley.

Chall: You've told me about her, about your having stood up for her.

Hosmer: Yes. You see, that's how I got. . . and, of course, Gladys knew about that, and she admired it. Some people respected me for my stands, and some of them just got mad at me, but I still took stands. I think you've gathered that by now! [laughter]

Chall: Yes. That doesn't stop you at all. [laughter]

Hosmer: I'm afraid you can't teach an old dog new tricks. But I got along very well with Gladys and she appointed me as Americanism chairman.

Chall: Oh, I see, that's an appointment.

Hosmer: Yes, that's appointed. The chairmanships are appointed. The chairmanships are all appointed by the president of the division or the club or the state organization, what have you.

Every time a newsletter went out, my work was to have included something about American heritage and American history. So, you see, I've been involved in this for a short span of time. [ironical tone of voice; laughs]

Chall: A long time. I see. That went out through the division?

Hosmer: Throughout the division. That was the Northern Division at that time.

And then she became state president. My roster sets it up as '55 to '56. I don't think that's right. Wait a minute. That isn't right.

Chall: That's only one year.

Hosmer: No, we had two-year terms. [There follows a discussion of the dates when Mrs. Penland and Mrs. Hosmer were officers of the Northern Division, with Mrs. Hosmer not completely satisfied that the roster was correct. Then she remembers some of the problems of the president's terms.] So that's when Gladys was president, but only two years. It must have been '54 to '56.

Chall: Well, we probably will fill that in then later. Let me just note it.

Hosmer: You see, what happened--Gladys O'Donnell served a term for somebody who--she died when she came on. Now, wait a minute.

I remember what happened. Jean Fuller was president from '51 to '54, and she served one year in her second term, and then she resigned because she got a state job, and Gladys went in.

Chall: Now, that's president of the state?

Hosmer: That's the state. Yes. And then Gladys Penland went in '55 to '56. That's how that went.

Chall: I see. So, she just had a short term.

Hosmer: Yes, she had a short term before she died.

Chall: Gladys Penland, then, died in office?

Hosmer: Yes, before she finished out her term.

Chall: And then who followed her, do you know? Cecil Kenyon?

Hosmer: Yes, Cecil Kenyon was in next.

Chall: Okay. So, she filled out Mrs. Penland's terms and then took her own.

Hosmer: Yes, and then served a second term, as I remember.

Chall: Yes. Okay. Well, we're getting there.

Hosmer: [laughter] You throw these things at me, and I have to go digging.

Chall: Well, I knew you would. That's why I gave you an outline. [laughter]

Hosmer: I know, but I just couldn't get to it.

Chall: That's all right.

Now, Americanism chairman meant that you wrote something special on--

Hosmer: On American history, usually.

Chall: On American history, for the newsletter of the division.

Hosmer: Of the division. And then when I became state Americanism chairman-- Mrs. Penland appointed me to the state board as Americanism chairman --then I wrote it for the whole state.

Chall: I see. Who gets the various bulletins? There's a bulletin that goes out from the county, is there, and then one from the division?

Hosmer: Yes, there is a letter from the county. But it depends upon the size of the county and how active the board is in the county and how large the membership is, how often the bulletin goes out. Sometimes they are quarterly bulletins. And with the Northern Division and the state, they're generally quarterly bulletins; they're not monthly.

When I was state president, I--I can't remember now. Was mine quarterly or monthly? [pauses to think] I think it was quarterly.

Chall: It would be quite a job to put out a big monthly newsletter with all that kind of information in it.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: That was your primary job, then. And how often did your board meet, the Northern Division board?

Hosmer: Well, they're a quarterly.

Chall: That's quarterly too?

Hosmer: The executive committee met prior to the regular meeting.

Chall: And those were quarterly meetings.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Generally held someplace where you could all meet?

Hosmer: In the north, and they had to be invited by a club, in some part of the country. We met--we tried to vary it. When I was Northern Division president, I'd try to have one in the far north, one in the central part of the north, and one down around the Bay Area, you see, or down in Monterey--something like that. And when I was state president I did the same thing, although we covered more territory.

Chall: So that there's quite a bit of work involved in this.

Hosmer: Yes, always. Then the conventions were the things that made my hair gray. [laughter]

Chall: How often?

Hosmer: Every two years.

Chall: There was a state convention?

Hosmer: Yes. The Northern Division followed the state convention. The Southern Division follows the state convention. It used to be that the state president was elected in the election year, and we changed that. That's how I got to have three years as a state president.

Chall: I wondered why that was.

Hosmer: Yes, that's why I had three years as a state president, because of the change in the bylaws, which started when I took office. I told Merritt I'd be working for two years; I didn't have the nerve for about six months to tell him it was going to be three.

Chall: It might have been four, though, if it hadn't changed.

Hosmer: Yes. [laughter] Well, then, you see, when I was state president I was on the national board as a state president, and then I was Americanism chairman for the state, and legislation chairman too at one time.

Chall: I guess when you were president of the county chapter your main work was as Americanism chairman.

Hosmer: For the division.

Chall: For the division, yes.

Hosmer: Now, I got to be vice-chairman--I got to be appointed to the county [Republican central] committee because a vacancy came up, and as president of the federation, I was. . . They wanted to put a woman on, and I was the first woman on there.

Chall: I see. Now, some newspaper clipping that I have indicated that you were the second woman.

Hosmer: Who was the first woman?

Chall: I don't know. I didn't bring my old notes with me, but I do recall the newspaper article. They said that you were the second. It may have been that you were--

Hosmer: Goodness gracious! Maybe I was put in her place.

Chall: No, no. It was somebody else, and I don't have those notes here either.

Hosmer: Isn't that funny!

Chall: We talked about that last time. It may have been that many years before there had been another woman, but I looked the article over again when I got back to the office and it read as if there were two women on there at that time; I mean, when you were appointed, you made the second woman. I know that the last time I was here you questioned that too.

Hosmer: I still do. I'll tell you, I can't--well, you know somebody who'd be able to find that out for us would be Naomi Youngduff. Did you talk with her?

Chall: Yes, I did.

Hosmer: She's a lovely person.

Chall: I haven't talked with her about the party, but I think maybe I should.

Hosmer: She was executive secretary of the San Mateo County Republican Central Committee for years.

Chall: Well, I'll have to have a talk with her.

Hosmer: She and I worked together from about 1952, and she's a very lovely person, very helpful, very nice.

Chall: Yes. All right. Well, then, we can clear that one up.

Hosmer: She and I worked together in so many things, and we always got along very well. She was very conscientious and a pleasant person to work with.

Chall: Well, I will go back and talk to her about this. Once you'd been appointed, then--

Hosmer: Then you had to run.

Chall: Then you had to run. So, then you did it.

Hosmer: Yes. No, it didn't bother me. I'd never run for office or anything before.

Chall: Now, John Dinkelspiel. I wanted you to tell me something about him.

Hosmer: John and I got along very well. We were good friends. John depended on me a lot. [chuckle] I don't know why he ever took the job, because nine-tenths of the time he wasn't even around. But he would let me handle the things in the county because of it, and there were just one or two times that we clashed on certain things. But basically speaking, it was a matter of personalities, somebody that they tried to move into the central committee, and I wouldn't tolerate it, or something like that. I can't remember the incident. I can't remember who it was. But he and Clara--we've always been friendly. We're far apart philosophically speaking in many ways. She had a brother who was quite radical. He was an editor of a wild, wild radical paper in England.

Chall: Is that Mrs. Dinkelspiel?

Hosmer: Mrs. Dinkelspiel. Clara.

Chall: Is she English?

Hosmer: Well, he went to England. He left America and went to England. I think he's dead now.

But once you get used to John, he's got a very sarcastic way about him. But he was a power at that time, and I think he was working for a judgeship at that time, from what I understood.

Hosmer: But insofar as our working together, we had no problems, and he always had me by his side when there was a meeting or a reception so I could tell him who the people were [chuckle] because he didn't know one person from another, because his office was in San Francisco. It was definitely--what should I say? I guess that's when "Goody" Knight was in office, wasn't it?

Chall: Yes, yes. He was chairman of the San Mateo County Republican Central Committee from 1954-1958.

Hosmer: Of course, "Goody" was promising everybody a judgeship! [laughter] I remember another attorney in San Mateo County. He'd gotten a letter from "Goody," you know, and the same thing. Somebody didn't keep tabs on the people that he'd written, you know, and so there was a lot of hard feeling about that.

But I wouldn't say--while he was of the liberal persuasion and I was conservative, there weren't the lines drawn that hard at that time, you know. We had a good crew, and there were so few of us [chuckle] that we could almost meet in a telephone booth. But we got along.

Then, of course, when the Eisenhower campaign came along, things kind of picked up. He was involved in that sort of thing--'56, the next campaign.

But I had no personal problems at all with John.

Chall: And the other members of the board the same?

Hosmer: Oh, we got along, yes. Later on, there was another brouhaha, or whatever you want to call it. That's when Younger ran.

Chall: I think we talked about the J. Arthur Younger campaign in our last meeting.

Methods of Organization

Chall: You are so touted, well known, for your ability to do precinct work and to gather all the forces together to get out the vote, and register voters, and all that goes into it, and for so many years that was your particular area--the precinct organization in this county. I just wondered whether you can recall what your techniques were. Also, I guess, you probably used the same ones to build up the federation during those years. You said you had--

Hosmer: Increased the membership.

Chall: Increased the membership.

Hosmer: From 58,000 to 63,000.

Chall: So, maybe you can tell me what--I know it's hard to think back, because you do them so automatically.

Hosmer: Yes, you get to the point--but I started out just doing precinct work, you see. Then when I was vice-chairman I was still doing it.

What I used to do, as I remember--now, this is just off the top of my head. What I would try to do was to have regional meetings within the county. In other words, I'd go to South San Francisco and Daly City--and what other town up there? Well, we didn't have the vast increase in population at that time. But we'd get somebody from the federation or from the central committee who lived up there to have a meeting at her home. Then we'd go into that meeting and try to sell these people on whatever candidate we were working for at that particular time.

The way I did it in the federation was I used to have traveling schools of politics, you see. But, I mean, it was almost the same thing on a smaller scale. I had with me somebody who did the work in the office, somebody who did the doorbell ringing and the door knocking, and somebody who did the registering and all that. I'd have them there to answer questions for the people whom we hoped to recruit for the job.

It was a tedious job, but at that time Bill was in the service and Merritt was busy all day, so I was able to do that sort of thing.

It was just taking it and we'd go over, like we went over to Half Moon Bay. We even had a unit in Half Moon Bay. I got it built up to 1,000 members in the county alone, you know.

But it was constant mailings to precinct lists. You see, you take the names of the Republicans in an area and you write them until you get a response.

Chall: Is that right?

Hosmer: Oh, boy, was it--

Chall: You wrote to them until you got a response?

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: Asking if--

Hosmer: Well, we had a few very dedicated women in the county, just like we had a few dedicated women in Northern California, who were willing to do things like that.

I even went up to Dunsmuir when I was Northern California president. It was really funny. The first time we went up there, we couldn't find --we found--we knew one or two women who were Republicans who'd come from Southern California and wrote, I think, and said, "Why don't we have a Republican club up there?" because they had been active in Southern California.

We went up there. They were a mother and a daughter. So, I said, "Well, you have a meeting at your house, and I'll come and talk to you when I'm up in the north on another tour." I'd try to combine the thing, because, boy, the miles really piled up!

So, she went out and she went to the courthouse and they got a precinct list. Well, the Republicans--it was a union town, and a strongly Democrat union-controlled railroad base of some kind. So, there were a lot of people in town that they knew. Of course, everybody knew everybody else, and it wasn't that big in those days. But nobody would admit they were Republicans, you see. So, they called them on the telephone, and I think they must have had forty or fifty people there, which was practically a miracle! [chuckle] So, we even had a club up there.

And that's about the way--the same in South San Francisco and Daly City. Of course, in Daly City, we had to have people of Italian extraction. So, we got a hold of one gal up there who used to have a restaurant called Marie's. I can't think of her last name now. What was it? Oh, dear! What was her last name?

Chall: Well, maybe it will come to you another time.

Hosmer: So, Marie helped in our campaigns up there. Then I'd go around and speak to them and explain it to them and what we wanted them to do and how they were to do it, and that's how I built it up.

When Goldwater ran, I had 2,300 precinct workers in this county. Of course, that was a one-shot. It was because it was something that some of the people saw--you know, there was a difference there, and so they were all enthused about it.

So, that was the way I did it, and I did the same thing when I was Northern Division president and state president. I'd take my key women.

The Traveling Schools of Politics

Hosmer: Now I started the traveling schools of politics.

Chall: Yes, I wanted to hear about those.

Hosmer: A lot of people are trying to take credit for it now, but I was the first one that did it. I was the first one to do it, and I'd have somebody in there on campaign, and then I'd have another person on precinct, and I'd have another person running an office, and I'd have another person on--oh, dear! I can't even remember all of the facets that were involved, but just every facet of a campaign activity in a campaign year, all the things you had to do, like getting cards, and lining people up, and getting telephone banks put together, and all of these things that are done in a campaign.

I'd have a person on the panel who was the best I knew in that particular field, and I always tried to include others and not just be the one doing it, and then I'd kind of pull it together.

Chall: I wondered whether the traveling schools included men, whether men were the students as well as women, and whether men were on your panel, or was this strictly women?

Hosmer: Well, we usually invited the county chairman everywhere we went. We always invited the county chairman to be part of it; that was just diplomatic. We are completely different, you see--the Democrats' structure and our structure. In the Democrat central committee, the women's organizations are under the control of the county central committee, but ours are completely separate. We have a separate charter. We are chartered by the National Federation of Republican Women, and then from that we got our state charter because of the number of clubs we were able to get per congressional district, which gave us our charter.

The only group that has jurisdiction over us beside our state organization is the national organization. We have nothing to do with the county central committee or the state central committee, but they've tried to take us over a number of times, and we stopped it. We've been doing that for years, you see.

So, that's where we differ, and it gave us a little more freedom. But, you see, as soon as the central committee, the party committee, tries to take over, immediately they want you to do nothing but fund raising.

Chall: I see. I would think they would have wanted you to do the very kinds of things you were doing.

Hosmer: Well, of course, most of the men did, on the Republican side. They were all businessmen too, lawyers and such, and most of them wanted you to do that kind of thing. But they didn't have the women in there at that time who knew anything about it.

Chall: So, your schools were simply to educate the women?

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: You were really building up your women's organization.

Hosmer: We were building up, but we were also studying the Republican party background and history and issues. I usually was the one that spoke on issues, so you can see that's how I got started talking about issues and started doing the research, because I knew that I would be coming up against the Democrat point of view and I wanted to be factual. As I told you before, I've always tried to stay away from personalities as much as I could. There were times, you know, when I couldn't [chuckle], but most of the time I'd try to do it on the basis of the principle and the candidate's qualifications and so on and so forth.

Chall: So, what was your aim then in these traveling schools of American politics? The aim was to train--

Hosmer: To educate women.

Chall: To educate women on how to--

Hosmer: On how to participate in a campaign. You see, what I always tried to point out was: You start in your local, in your county area. You get to be good and known at the county level. You do the precinct work at the county level. You get to know the candidates that are elected from your county. And then later, if you continue on that, then you can go up to the state level, and you have the background and training to know what's coming at you from all directions, which they do.

So, then the women are sufficiently educated so that they're capable of judging candidates and the issues. They're capable of judging issues because we study issues. We spend whole sessions on just studying nothing but the issues.

Chall: In the traveling schools?

Hosmer: In the traveling schools we did that too, because there's always controversial issues every time there's an election, and the traveling schools of politics were done the year before the election year to get them trained and ready for election year.

Chall: How long would each school session last?

Hosmer: Usually morning and afternoon.

Chall: Oh, I see.

Hosmer: The whole day. At least a whole day. [chuckle] I might as well have gone ahead and become a schoolteacher. In fact, my mother wanted me to, you know--because that's exactly what I've been doing over the years. But it was a fascinating experience, and, of course, I loved going around California, you know, and all that. You really meet some awfully nice women in the process. You meet a few that don't exactly jibe, but, you know, you're always running into a certain element of--who should be greatest? It's one of these things that any organization--I don't care whether it's a church group [laughs] or a sorority or anything you could mention. You're always going to have a certain amount of that, with which you have to contend.

But normally speaking, if you're nice to people, they're nice to you--just like when I was working in merchandising and buying. You find in meeting and working with the public--one of the things you find is that most of the people with whom you have to deal are decent and not hard to get along with.

But there's always a small percentage of them who are just plain stinkers, and they're going to be that way, whether they're there, or elsewhere, and they want to take it out on you because you're serving them. It's one of the things that you just learn as you go through life, that there's a certain element like that which you meet, and you have to learn to handle it, without getting--

Chall: Oh, I know.

Hosmer: You know it too. I mean, you're bound to run into that. And there's always people with prejudice.

I remember one time I was giving a talk on our American heritage, and I was talking about the Christian background of the nation. Someone said to me, "What made you get on that kick?" [laughter] You know, just like that! And I said, "Well, it's a matter of record. It's there. I can document it. I'll give it to you." I said, "It doesn't exclude. It's inclusive; it's not exclusive."

She said, "How do the Jewish people feel about it?" I said, "Well, then, I tell them that I know there was a Jewish church established here in the late 1600s. They don't have any complaints to make." [laughs] But I said, "The first people who came here came here to propagate Christianity. I wasn't taking any cracks at anybody. And Christianity includes the Judaic Ten Commandments and a few other things." [laughs]

Hearing Both Sides of an Issue

Chall: So, as you went around, you presented the issues then as you felt they should be presented?

Hosmer: No, both sides. This was something different.

Chall: Yes. Well, in the schools, how did you--? There were issues that were coming up, let's say, in the election.

Hosmer: Well, we had legislative chairmen, and I had been a legislative chairman; and so they knew that. But I might give. . . In many cases I had the legislative chairman give--try to, you know, because one of the things I found in these schools of politics, if you can have a change of pace, and a change of voice, and a change of person, you don't lose attention as fast as if one person is going to talk for two or three hours, and it gets to the point where people go to sleep. You can't blame them. I mean, even if you're a good speaker, it's bound to happen.

So, normally I would have somebody who'd specialize in one issue, and I'd assign somebody else to talk on another one. Now, you go back to some of the battles that were going on, like the crossfiling. That would be one thing. We had so many hot fights on the crossfiling.

Of course, I had one opinion because my dad had fought Hiram Johnson on crossfiling when he was in the state legislature. He thought it was destructive of party strength and party control. But then many candidates thought it was great because they weren't beholden to anybody then; nobody could check up on them.

But I always had that point of view expressed too. Just like with Ruth Watson. She and I were on the state committee and the Northern Division board, and I even had her on my state board, and people couldn't understand it because she was quite liberal. But Ruth was honest, and one of the things I've always tried to point out is that even the moderates and the liberals are just as honest in their beliefs as we are in our beliefs, and they're doing the things they're doing because they believe it's better for themselves and their families and their country.

So, we have to give credit and allow them to have their point of view, because freedom of conscience is the basis on which our nation is founded. This is the kind of thing that gets the goat [chuckle] sometimes of some of my conservative friends. I go out and speak so conservatively and be so adamant about my point of view, which I can be [chuckle], but they just can't understand it when I do

Hosmer: things like that. But, you know, I believe in that sort of thing. It's just part of my background, and I was told to remember what-- wasn't it Voltaire who said, "I disagree with your opinion, but I defend to the death your right to say it?"

Chall: That's right.

Hosmer: Something like that.

And I'll never forget Ruth Watson. She was a very good speaker, an excellent person, but quite liberal. She came to me after one time we'd had a big hassle. I've forgotten even now what the issue was. "Lucile," she said, "I just don't understand you." I said, "What's the matter?" She said, "You got up there and you said what you did, and when somebody tried to shut me up, you told them to let me speak." And I said, "Well, you have as much right to your opinion as I do." She said, "You're unique!" [laughter] Because she was just, you know--she was just like this [gestures] on what she was voting against. So, it was an interesting experience.

And then I had another experience similar to that that was down at a state convention after I went out of office. I don't know what the controversy was then, but I spoke my piece, and I had about four or five people come up and say, "We don't always agree with you, Lucile, but we have confidence in your opinion and we trust your judgment, because we know you're honest about it."

But I have felt always that the other fellow has just as much right. I think it was my background and training. I think my parents were like that.

Chall: But over the years, in the last--well, let's say particularly in '64--I would guess that that ability on the part of the conservatives, and maybe on the liberals' too, to give a little--that wasn't quite so apparent. And we'll talk about the '64 campaign next time we talk.

Hosmer: [hearty laugh]

Chall: But I do feel that this is very good, what you've just said, because what I've read about the '64 campaign and what I remember about it personally is that there was strong rigidity.

Hosmer: Oh, yes, yes.

Chall: The kind that could be seen right now in the Reagan candidacy, but which--

Hosmer: He's smart enough not to let it happen.

Chall: Yes, again. And we will probably come to that. I think there were the beginnings of it, probably, in the '58 campaign with Knowland.

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: And we will probably get to that today, so I'm glad that you can fill me in on your own philosophy.

Well, the results of the schools of politics must have been quite gratifying, because you must have built up a cadre of strong women workers.

Hosmer: Yes, I did. I still run into women who tell me I started them in schools of politics, you know, and that goes back a long way. And there were one or two that I told to stay out because their children were small. I said, "What's the use of going out and changing the country if you wreck your home." Some of them just couldn't believe it, but that's something I believe very strongly.

Chall: Yes. There's a great deal of work in campaigning, so that you're really thrust into it, and there is campaign material all over your floor, and on the tables, and you're on the phone a great deal of the time. You do have to find little ways of doing your job. It may be just carrying literature on one block, rather than being in charge of it.

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: I guess the need is for people to see how you can break down the tasks.

Hosmer: This was part of our schools, you see. We showed them how they could do that. Even in this county, we had it broken down--assembly district, and then even farther down to supervisorial district, you see. Of course, the supervisors were elected countywide in those days, but your assembly districts were really the smallest element, unless it's the. . . But then you'd come down clear to the town. Trying to get a chairman in each town is real "iffy." It's something that you tear your hair out about.

Chall: So, you actually did try to get a chairman in each of these districts?

Hosmer: That's right. Each assembly district and each town within the assembly district.

Chall: The federation was trying to do that?

Hosmer: The county central committee. Under the state law, the state central committee is in charge of campaigns in the state, and under the state committee it is the county central committee who is supposed to be

Hosmer: responsible for the campaigns. The federation is not responsible for it at all, but they always glommed on to it. [laughter] They are the ones that the men expected to do the work. Of course, this is one of the things that has been built up, I think, in both parties, where the women realize that they're the ones that do the work, but they never had any say.

One of the things I like about the Reagan delegation: Seventy-five percent of those people are brand new people, never been to a convention before, plus the fact that everyone on that delegation is a person that worked for Reagan in some capacity or another, answering telephones, telephone banks, in the headquarters, mailings, and going out and recruiting other people. You see, that's the way it should be, because those are the people who are basically solid for their candidate, and it's by participating for a candidate, working for a candidate, that you get some enthusiasm.

I started all this when Merritt was on the high school board, working to get him back on the board. That's how I got involved. And then the gal who handled all that, the friend of mine who did that, was a newspaperwoman, and she really knew her stuff. She's somebody. If you wanted to get another oral picture of politics [laughter], she would be great!

The State Central Committee: Selecting the Leaders

Chall: That year 1954, it seemed that the problem in the state central committee was the choice of the vice-chairman. Now, frequently the issue seems to revolve over the choice of the vice-chairman, because he's going to be the chairman the following year.

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: So, at that time, I guess right after Earl Warren went to Washington there was the vying for position among the Republicans in California to fill the vacuum. This was about the first evidence of it, I guess.

Hosmer: Gee. I'm trying to remember who I supported.

Chall: Governor Knight wanted Howard Ahmanson, and Roy Arbuthnot was presumably the choice of Nixon and [Murray] Chotiner.

Hosmer: Didn't Ahmanson get it?

Chall: Yes, Ahmanson did. Knight was supported, according to the records--the writers at least--by Kuchel and Knowland in that particular controversy.

Hosmer: Kuchel and Knowland. Well, then, I was probably with his support, because you see, Knight was the one who had filed against Warren before when he still wanted another term. A lot of us weren't too happy with Warren in California. So, I would have gone along with Knight at that point. I never did have too much enthusiasm about Chotiner. He was a political animal all right.

Chall: And I guess Nixon was the vice-president then.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Maybe nobody was paying that much attention to his role in here. As a matter of fact, I think Pat Hillings, after Ahmanson was elected, wanted to play down the Nixon role in that so that he didn't have his name involved.

Hosmer: Yes, I wouldn't be surprised. Pat Hillings was a strange character too.

Chall: I see. But these were men who were very active in politics.

Hosmer: Yes, I remember. Pat Hillings came up to San Mateo County for one of our dinners, you know, and the man who introduced him took twenty minutes to introduce him.

Chall: Oh, yes. There are some introducers who want to make speeches.
[laughter]

Hosmer: Oh! He did! We didn't think we were ever going to get him to finish. He's been one of our stalwart supporters of the party. He's still around, so I wouldn't even tell you who he was. But I'll never forget that as long as I live. We sat there at the head table and just thought, "Oh, can't you quit?" Oh, it was just awful!

[reading the outline] By the selection of members of the central committee, do you mean here or up on the state level?

Chall: At the state level, the state central committee.

Hosmer: Well, you see, we don't have much to say about that. The candidates appoint; each candidate is allowed to appoint two members of the opposite sex and one of his own sex to the central committee. That's something that the assemblymen, and state senators, and congressmen, and United States Senators do on their own, and their campaign chairmen within the state advise whom they think they could use on the state central committee for their purposes.

Chall: And so they'll go along with that?

Hosmer: They'll usually go along with that, unless the pressures are so great within their own districts that they consider it. Of course, you've got to realize that the state central committee of either party runs the campaigns and runs the whole structure of the party in the intervening years, so those who have political ambitions really fight for places on the state committee.

I was head of the principles committee at one time there, and I was the head of something else. I've been different things at different times.

But the only thing would be if some candidate or some person in office would call me and ask me what I thought about certain women, or something like that, then I could recommend or say that I'd just as soon that it could be somebody better or something like that. But that didn't happen too often. They had enough feedback in this thing, although I did with one or two of them, but not too many of them.

Chall: And you feel that since you were appointed--you by Dolwig and others--that you wouldn't have too much to say about who was appointed to either the state offices or the women's vice-chairmen?

Hosmer: Well, the state convention, where the various officers are selected--the officers are selected by the executive committee. No, wait a minute.

Chall: No.

Hosmer: No, wait a minute. I'm jumping the gun here. When we have our state conventions, we have caucuses of different groups who make up the state central committee. The women's division has its own meeting to recommend for the vice-chairmen: one from the north, one from the south, and one from the central. And the women's division also at their caucus makes a recommendation for the secretary or assistant secretary or such like that. Those things all go behind closed doors and different groups get together and push for different candidates.

Then, if the chairman is from the south, then the vice-chairman has to be from the north, and vice versa. And then we've always had the three women vice-chairmen. That's been part of it.

Chall: Yes. And are they appointed?

Hosmer: They're elected. I mean, they are supported; they are nominated. First of all, the women go into caucus and they select the person they want.

Chall: Those are regional caucuses?

Hosmer: Yes, one from the north, one from the south, and one from the central. And they bring that name to the floor, and that person is accepted or rejected, and of course there have been times, for all of these offices, that someone's been nominated from the floor, at different times. I mean, they are free to do that, you see. It's not something completely cut and dried. They are free to do that under the bylaws. They are free to nominate from the floor on any occasion and second the nominations too. So, we've had a few pretty strenuous battles, but not an awful lot.

Chall: I once read some place, and I wasn't really sure about this, how there were associate members of the central committee, and they were generally made up of women. Were there associate members who were women, and were there associate members who were not women?

Hosmer: Associate members were under the same program, I guess, or policy. Men were all candidates. I mean, all of the office holders were men in those days. We didn't have many women. We had Pauline Davis up in the north end of the state. That's about the only one, Pauline Davis.

But the men had to appoint two of the opposite sex--which multiplied the number of women--and one of their sex. So, as a member of the state central committee, I would have to appoint one woman and two men as my associates.

Chall: How come?

Hosmer: That was just the policy. It was probably to sort of balance the thing?

Chall: But it was already fifty-fifty, just on the basis of the way they had to select their own members of the central committee--as committee members. I'm just wondering who the associates were or why you even had them. I'm not sure that the Democrats have them.

Hosmer: We had the associates because we wanted them to work from the state level, and we wanted them to help. The people that I selected are the people that I wanted who I knew I could count on to carry out the rulings as they came down from the state committee in the areas of precinct and campaign and things like that, you see.

Chall: So it was a way of giving them a feeling of participation without a vote?

Hosmer: That's right, yes.

Chall: Because they didn't have a vote.

Hosmer: Well, they have a voice, but no vote, and they contributed. In other words, if you were a member of the state committee, your membership fee was a lot higher, and if you were an associate member it was just half that price. It was just building the strength of the party. It was a good way of doing it, I felt.

Chall: It's not in practice any longer, is it?

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: It is?

Hosmer: Yes, as far as I know. I haven't been on for the last four years, I guess.

Women and the Role of the Federation of Republican Women

Chall: Well, that's close enough.

Were the women whom you appointed generally members of the federation?

Hosmer: Nearly always. It's the same way with the people who were appointed by the candidates normally, or the office holders.

You see, another thing, and I don't want to forget this: If a Republican won the Republican nomination, he still was able to appoint somebody to the state central committee, even if he didn't win the election.

But most of the women who did the work were the federation women. Not always. Now, there was Pro-America, who were more active in those days than they are now, in San Francisco and Marin County. But there were other women who were maybe good moneybags, you know, who had contributed money or they'd offered their homes or had been active just in helping a specific candidate. There are candidate committees, you see, all over. It was considered a sort of a reward, an honor for what they did, because of what they did.

Chall: I see. So that it would seem that in caucus the federation would probably have quite a bit of influence.

Hosmer: Well, they would, because they were really the only women who were--- shall I say they were the only truly politically educated women in the state at the time.

Hosmer: You see, the League of Women Voters was supposed to be nonpartisan, which it never was. [chuckle] But that was ridiculous. But they still pose in that category. I used to go to their meetings in San Francisco, but I got so fed up with their slanted views that I just stopped going.

They never went into things specifically like that. They went along just with issues. They didn't do any training of women in how to and what to and when to and where to, like we did in the Republican party. I mean, in the federation; I shouldn't say in the Republican party.

Chall: Yes, I see. Well, I want to establish the role of the federation.

Hosmer: Well, the federation is the most powerful organization in the country, you know. Some states have more and some states have less in membership than we do, but they've carried quite a bit because they do all have educational programs; they had them in Washington. I've been back to many of their conferences when that's all they devoted their time to. It started with the Eisenhower years, I'd say, and from then on. I think they had more of them than before.

Chall: Yes, I think that's probably right.

In 1954, Tom Caldecott was elected as the Northern California chairman of the party, and Howard Ahmanson, whom we've just discussed, was the vice-chairman. Now, the women: Gladys O'Donnell from the northern--

Hosmer: Southern California.

Chall: Southern?

Hosmer: She's from Long Beach.

Chall: I have her in the wrong place. No, wait a minute. She was elected secretary. Jane Zimmerman--

Hosmer: She's from San Francisco.

Chall: Yes. She had a long--well, several terms there--two terms. It was women's division, north. She was one of the hardest-working gals. Jane was about as hard working and conscientious as a person can be. I always liked Jane and I respected her for her hard work and what she did. We were friendly. Once again, her philosophy and mine were quite dissimilar, but when a person is a good workman. . . In her position she stayed neutral on things that she should have stayed neutral on, from my point of view. So, I always respected and liked Jane very much.

Chall: Have you any recollection of why she might have been chosen for the women's division vice-chairman, north, over Patricia Connich? Do you remember Patricia Connich?

Hosmer: Pat Connich was--you know, I haven't even thought of her in years. I really don't know. They were about contrasted individuals as you could find, and I think that Patricia was a little bit on the abrasive side, and Jane got along better with people of all factions, better than Pat did. Pat was a very intelligent woman, a very attractive woman, as I remember her. I'm having a hard time remembering her.

Chall: Well, she just might have wanted not to be on any more.

Hosmer: Well, I think that she bowed out after that. A lot of people do when they're defeated; they quit, you know. They don't want to have anything--they're looking for a position, and if they don't get it, then they just bow out. I'm not saying she did it for that reason.

Chall: Yes. Well, we might catch up on that another time.

I suppose you wouldn't have had much to do with the appointment of the central division vice-chairman, but Ysabel Forker took over from Florence Doe.

Hosmer: Yes. [laughs] Ysabel Forker was one of a kind in captivity! I don't know if she's still alive. She was about pretty close to six feet; not quite, maybe five-ten or -eleven, but big, you know. Well, you know how dwarfed you'd feel around somebody like that. And, "Ruff, ruff!" [imitates gruff, barking sound] She ran the central division just really with an iron hand, and she wouldn't let Pro-America work in there. I remember there was a lot of feeling about that. [chuckle]

There's no other way of describing Ysabel Forker except as a character, though she was quite controversial and there were those who felt that she never let anybody in do anything, you know, that might be in competition to her, and then there were others who felt that she did a good job.

I never was associated too much with the central division at that time. I wasn't until I became state president. I knew some of them, and then I got to know the women better in those areas, because I traveled over there and stayed with some of them.

I had met Ysabel at different state central committee meetings. We didn't have any confrontations because I didn't let it happen, because I felt it would be kind of [laughs] one-sided. She was a

Hosmer: Spanish teacher, I believe. I'm sure she was part Spanish. She had shiny black hair and was [ironically] slightly opinionated. [laughter]

Chall: Was she a liberal, opinionated on the liberal side?

Hosmer: I don't even know. I can't even tell you at this point.

Chall: Yes. But she was strong.

Hosmer: She was extremely strong. Whatever her opinions were, she was most definite. [laughs]

Chall: Frances Larsen from the south took over from Mildred Younger, and I don't know why Mildred Younger--I'll have to ask her. Well, she was going to run for office.

Hosmer: Well, Mildred Younger was going to run for office at that time.

Chall: Yes. That may have been the reason. And Frances Larsen?

Hosmer: Frances Larsen was Southern California vice-chairman.

Chall: Yes.

Hosmer: Frances was a likable person. She was always friendly and smiling and everything. I liked Frances.

But I think you've got to realize when you get to the state level on any kind of a job, there's bound to be controversy about you. I don't care who you are or how well you're doing your job. Somebody isn't going to think you're doing the job right. That's something that I know for a fact. It's just one of those things. There are always people who are absolutely positive they could do a far better job than you're doing if they only had the chance, and how did you get it instead of them?

I don't care whether you're vice-chairman of a division, or a president, or a vice-president, or a regional vice-president, or what have you. There are always the sideline criticizers and complainers, and, "You didn't do this right," and, "You didn't do that right," and, "Why didn't you do this?" and, "Why didn't you do that?" But they're not there when you need them, so many of them. Not all of them. I mean, sometimes there are legitimate complaints or legitimate criticisms. I mean, none of us are perfect in our judgments, and we are bound to make mistakes, even I! [laughs] I could have a pile up so high [gestures] of mistakes I have made! [laughter]

Hosmer: But, so, sometimes it's a little difficult to try to hew a line between what's right and what's wrong, especially over a period of years, you know.

Chall: It's better just to drop out once in a while and let somebody else take over.

Hosmer: Yes, that's right. I don't believe in perpetuating yourself forever and ever, just like when I got through with my state job, I just dropped out and started being active in Pro-America. I did that on purpose. There were two girls coming up that I thought were going to be good presidents, and I thought that they could handle the job better without me breathing down their necks.

I did the same with Northern Division. I didn't even go to the first Northern Division meeting after I went out, because I thought that, you know, why should the new president feel that I'm sitting there watching what she does and how she does it. I had that happen to me.

Chall: As Northern Division president?

Hosmer: As state president.

Chall: Oh, state president.

Hosmer: No, Gladys Penland wasn't that kind. She didn't bother me in any way.

Chall: So, it was Mrs. [Cecil] Kenyon who looked over your shoulder?

Hosmer: Oh, boy! She sure did, in more ways than one.

Chall: I see. Was her husband's name Cecil, or was that her first name?

Hosmer: That's her first name.

Chall: I couldn't quite tell. Was she called "Cecil?"

Hosmer: Oh, yes. Cecil Kenyon. She used to come to the meetings with her books, her Bible and her Science and Health, in hand.

Chall: Her what? Her Bible and what else?

Hosmer: Science and Health.

Chall: Science and Health. That's the Christian Science material?

Hosmer: Christian Science, yes.

Chall: And she would come to the meetings with that? What was the reason? Just that she would bring them to the meetings?

Hosmer: To show you how pure she was. [laughs] I shouldn't have said that! I'm sorry.

Chall: No, that's very interesting.

Hosmer: She was a strange mixture. She was another one of the Sherman tank types [laughs] if you got in her way, but she was always very sweet about it! [hearty laugh]

Chall: She had the office here for two terms.

Hosmer: Yes, I know she did! [laughs]

Chall: Was she a strong conservative, or where was she politically?

Hosmer: Oh, gosh! She was a strong conservative. [chuckle] I always blamed her for advising Knowland to use the right-to-work as one of his issues when he was running for governor.

Chall: Really?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: She had that much strength?

Hosmer: Well, her husband was president of Edison Electric in Southern California.

Chall: Oh, I see.

Hosmer: I don't know whether he was president, but he was way up there.

Chall: He was an official of Edison Electric?

Hosmer: Yes, an official of Edison.

Chall: So, they were close to the Knowlands, I guess.

Hosmer: Yes. But anyhow [laughs], we had some confrontations, shall I say. She tried to stop me from becoming state president. She did stop me from other things, but not that one. But she was very pure about the whole thing the whole time! [hearty laugh]

Chall: I think someone ought to do a history just of the federation. It would be fascinating!

Hosmer: [laughs] Oh, it would, really!

Chall: Just fascinating!

Hosmer: [heartly laugh] The women I have known. . .

Chall: Yes, they were very interesting women.

Hosmer: Have you had many talks with Marjorie Benedict?

Chall: We haven't started with her yet. We will this fall. She's ready to start.*

Hosmer: That will be interesting to see what she has to say. She has a different point of view, you know, from mine. She certainly perpetuated herself. She saw to it that anybody that began coming up stopped, you know. She was like Catherine Kennedy Brown back in Ohio.

Catherine Kennedy Brown, you know, was chairman of Ohio Republican Women nigh on to thirty years, and so was Marjorie. It would be very interesting if Marjorie tells you where she got her funds to do the things.

Chall: Well, we certainly will find out as much as we can.

Hosmer: Because she was Knowland's gal. At least that's what has always been understood.

But I'll tell you one thing about Marjorie: She worked her head off to try to get women recognized on the county committees and the state committee, and she believed in that very thoroughly, and she worked very hard for that. But individually, women whom she became afraid might challenge her job, they didn't fare very well. That included Jane Zimmerman and a lot of the other gals from the north.

I didn't have any specific run-ins with her, but when she did retire, she wanted to pick somebody from the south, not have anybody in the north.

Chall: I see. So, that meant then that she had--well, somebody had--the power to keep the national committeeman always in the south, then, because it had to be this way.

Hosmer: Marjorie in the north, yes.

Chall: Otherwise she would have lost her position?

Hosmer: Sure, she would have. That went on for years. Of course, that was something we were able to change, but not until after Marjorie went out.

*Marjorie Benedict's oral history, now in process, is a part of this series on California Women Political Leaders.

Chall: Able to change.

Hosmer: So that there was a rotation back and forth, north and south.

Chall: Oh, did you?

Hosmer: Yes. They've been doing that for the last--oh, let's see--six years.

Chall: Well, that was in 1960 that started.

Hosmer: Yes. Or '64 maybe it was. I can't remember. I'd have to get that.

Chall: Well, yes. Gardiner Johnson was national committeeman from the north from '64-'68 and Joseph Martin, Jr. was from 1960-1964, so that means there were two national commiteemen from the north. I see. And after that it was the north/south. Well, isn't that interesting. I didn't know that. I hadn't even paid that much attention.

Hosmer: The girl was in the south in that year that Gardiner Johnson was up here.

Chall: Yes, that's right. Ann Bowler.

Hosmer: Ann Bowler, yes. Have you met with her yet?

Chall: Not yet. I'm not sure that I will.

Hosmer: [laughs] This can be an education! It can! Have you heard about her?

Chall: I heard only that she was president of the--

Hosmer: Southern Divison. [1972-1974]

Chall: The Southern Division. I think I heard that there was some kind of problem or controversy between her and Jean Fuller at one time, but I don't know whether that was so; they're both from the south. So, that may not be quite right.

Hosmer: I don't think Ann was active that far back. There was a problem with her and Pat Hitt.

Chall: Oh, I see. Well, I hadn't heard that.

Hosmer: Well, Ann is a very strong person and she's got lots of money like Gladys O'Donnell who had, you know, a lot of money. She comes from-- I don't know whether it's Oklahoma or Arkansas--one of those states back there. And, boy, she can tell jokes that would just curl your hair! And you never know when she's going to tell them. [chuckle] She'd just scare me to death! [laughs] And they weren't exactly. . . I got them!

Chall: [laughter] It took a bit of probing?

Hosmer: But that was before I was on the parole board, and I hadn't learned as many things as I learned after I got on there. And she'd have a few. . . Well, she's quite a character. She's a good-hearted gal, but you never know which way she's going to jump next. Very much a conservative, but she's a little on the difficult side to work with.

Chall: Was she president of the--?

Hosmer: She was president of Los Angeles County and then the Southern Division.

Chall: But she never became president of the state, as far as you know?

Hosmer: I don't think she ever did. Wait a minute. [pauses to think]

Chall: Well, I'll check out your booklet.

Hosmer: I don't think Ann was ever state president. It's one of her bitter-nesses, I think. Cecil [Kenyon] kept her out originally, and then later they got to be friends. No. She wasn't state president.

Chall: All right.

Hosmer: But she'd be interesting. She has a tremendous sense of humor.

Chall: Well, I haven't contacted her yet, mostly because I'm not sure whether I'm going to have enough money.

Hosmer: Well, I can see what you mean.

Chall: I don't know whether I'll get to Eleanor Ring or Elsa Sandstrom either.

Hosmer: Eleanor Ring is somebody you shouldn't miss. She's got quite an interesting background. Her name isn't Ring, by the way, anymore. She got married the other day, about two weeks ago.

Chall: Oh, really?

Hosmer: Do you want me to get her address and name for you? [goes to find name and address]

Chall: All right.

Hosmer: It's what I would call one of those nice marriages in that she and her husband and this man and his wife were friends together for many, many years, both admirals and the two wives, and they went and did

Hosmer: things together, and so on and so forth. Eleanor's husband picked up a virus in the South Pacific during World War II, which kept him in a wheelchair and did something to him. He was alive, and it had paralyzed even his speaking ability, and he was in a wheelchair around her place.

I've known Eleanor, I guess, since about 1958 or so. She was San Diego County chairman, and then she was national committeewoman, you know, after that.

Chall: Yes, and she was also southern vice-chairman for a time.

Hosmer: Yes, she was. But she's a very fine person. She's all navy; her whole family is navy. Her husband was an admiral, one son is a captain, her daughter married a captain, and the other boy died of leukemia in the service.

So, her husband's been gone now for about six or seven years, and Put's wife has been gone about the same time. He is Rear Admiral (Retired) Putnam Storrs, and they're still living in Eleanor's place in Coronado.

President, Northern Division, California Federation of Republican Women, 1957-1960

Chall: Okay. Maybe we've already talked about your becoming president of the Northern Division but I'm not sure in how much detail.

Hosmer: Well, I did go up from Americanism chairman to Northern Division president--Americanism chairman of the Northern Division. There was a gal, a vice-president, by the name of--oh, I can see it. [trying to think of name] Oh, for heaven's sake! Isn't that ridiculous. What was her name? [pauses to think] I can't even think of her name right now. [Raymonde Thielle]

She was a vice-president. She had been a WAC or a WAVE. I guess she had been a WAVE in the service. But she's one of these very tight-lipped, you know, thin-lipped people that was very hard to get along with and very sarcastic with people.

I don't remember much about that, except that members of the executive board came to me and asked me if I would take it, because they didn't think that she would be able to keep the division together. Ardis Myhrs at that time was still on the board, and she was pushing for me, and Gladys Penland was pushing for me; and that's how it happened. I was the nominee, and I don't believe we even had a contest. I think I got the nomination and that was it. I can't remember who--

Chall: Is there a nominating committee procedure?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. There's a nominating committee procedure.

Chall: That's not automatic?

Hosmer: No, it's not automatic. And I can't remember--isn't that funny! I can see her yet. What was her name? Isn't that funny how we forget these names and we can see these people so clearly. She was a very close friend of--well, maybe it will come to me before we're through. Usually these things do.

Chall: So, it isn't usual, then, for a person to just almost--

Hosmer: Jump over?

Chall: Within a few years become president of the Northern Division, without several years in office of one kind or another?

Hosmer: I had four years as a county president. And then I had been on the Northern Division board.

Chall: Yes, that's true.

Hosmer: And then I had been on the state board. I'd been a member since '45, so, you see, it wasn't as if I was a person just coming in off the street. We did have one case of that before Ardis got on.

But isn't that silly? I can see that gal as clear as anything, and yet I can't remember her name.

Chall: Her name may be in some of your old papers.

How did your husband feel about your going on into this new job here?

Hosmer: He liked it. He didn't like to travel. He wasn't a person who liked to go places. He liked to stay home. He had his machine shop and his chemistry lab and his photography lab [laughs] and all of those things in the basement, and he liked to fool around with that sort of thing. So, it didn't bother him. He was very proud of me, really, and he thought it would kind of satisfy my itchy foot, because I love to go places and things like that.

So, I mean, we were very compatible. He was always interested, and, of course, he was active in local and county politics over all the years he was alive. And then, of course, at this time Bill was away at school, so that made a difference too.

Chall: I noticed--this also comes from an article in the San Mateo Times--that your son had graduated from high school, I think it was, the Brown Military Academy. What was your decision there?

Hosmer: Well, that was at the time Merritt was on the high school board, and they were taking it out on Bill because of the stands that Merritt was taking, including a merit system for teachers, which they did not like, and because he was fighting the core curriculum in the social living courses. It got so bad that one of the teachers down there just told him he was a dope and he would belittle him in front of the class, and Merritt went down and took him on. And when Merritt took somebody on, they were taken.

Merritt was a marvelous speaker. He was a very powerful man. He was a big man, and very handsome, and he had one of the most brilliant minds I ever knew. He could take on that whole board if he disagreed with them, and they were sorry that he did.

So, I also took on the man and said it was certainly something that was beyond belief that a man who called himself a teacher would treat a youngster that way. He called him a "kiss-ass" in front of the kids. You know, you just can't believe it, you know.

Chall: Oh, my!

Hosmer: And Bill was just the friendliest little guy, and he still is a friendly man. Kids love him, animals love him, dogs love him, you know, and people, because he gets along with them because he is a friendly person.

So, we decided--and it was about the time there were all the rumblings on the Korean War--that the best thing for him was to get him out of the school. So, that's how we decided to send him down to the Brown Military Academy for his last year of high school.

Chall: Oh, I see. It was just that one year.

Hosmer: And he did very well. He even had the lead in the play, and he had a good time down there.

Chall: And then he went directly into the Air Corps.

Hosmer: Yes. Then he enlisted in the Air Corps. He wasn't ready for school. He wouldn't have been able to handle it, because he just had no self-confidence at all. You see, in that social living course you had the same teacher for two years for two hours a day, and if the teacher didn't like you, you know, it just destroyed you. And it was so rotten that they'd take their fight out on Bill and just try to put him down and tell him how dumb he was and how stupid he was. So, when he did come out, he didn't think he had the brains to do anything.

Hosmer: So, he enlisted in the Air Force, and I was hoping he'd just wait, you know, because that meant four years. He spent two years in Bavaria in Germany as a radio operator, because he was a ham operator. That was one of the things he did. And then he came back and went to San Mateo Junior College, and then he went down to Menlo College for business administration, and he did all right in college. But he's become a marvelous student since he left, just like I did. He's quite a student and he does a lot of research and writing and things like that.

So, that's how he happened to be down there.

Chall: Yes. I had a feeling it had to be something to do with what was going on in the high school at the time.

Hosmer: It was! It was that, and it was just that antagonism. There was a group down there at that time that ran the school. And then the other thing was the Stanford School of Education was using it as an experimental school.

Chall: Yes, you've explained that.

Hosmer: Yes. You see, we didn't have any choice at that time. So, we finally just felt for his own safety that he had to be taken out of there.

Chall: So, it was all right with your family that you were going on and upwards in the federation.

Hosmer: Well, you see, when Bill was small I never left the county. I was home when he came home, even from high school, because I believed in that. It wasn't until after he went down there that I started doing anything out of the county, like going to the Northern Division or anything like that. Merritt was able to take care of himself; he had been a bachelor for a long time.

Chall: Yes, that's right. Did you change any goals, or did you have a point of view about changing directions or goals in the federation at that time? Now, this was '56 to '60, and there was all kinds of political activity going on in the state and nation, as you probably remember. Did you work on anything special?

Hosmer: Well, of course, my goal as president was to increase membership-- that's when we started the schools of politics, the traveling schools of politics. I started that when I was Northern Division president. It was education. My main goal was educating women and educating women for political activities and responsibilities, and that you had to have knowledge if you're going to be competent to handle things. It still is my goal. [laughs] But with another generation, I guess!

- Chall: So, we can then go on to what you were doing in the Republican party. You had to wait until after the primaries before you could be active in the Republican campaign.
- Hosmer: No, we couldn't pre-primary endorse. We weren't allowed to do that.
- Chall: And as an officer you also couldn't campaign for anybody, could you?
- Hosmer: Not as president, not as president of the state, the division, or your local club. The president couldn't do that.
- Chall: Could the vice-presidents or any of the chairmen?
- Hosmer: The chairmen could. The regional vice-presidents could not because they represented the federation in each region. Would you like some water? [interruption; tape turned back on in mid-conversation]
- What was her name now? I believe it's in here some place.
[looking through papers] Henriette Steinegger.
- Chall: Oh, yes. I want you to tell me about Raymonde--what's her last name?
- Hosmer: [spelling] T-h-i-e-l-l-e.
- Chall: Raymonde Thielle?
- Hosmer: Yes. Now, years later they roomed together. She [Henriette] never forgave me because I supported Elsa Sandstrom for state president instead of her. But I had a reason for it, and my reason was that when Gladys O'Donnell was running against Phyllis Schlafly for national president, she, as Northern Division president, supported Gladys publicly, and, you know, never missed a chance. She had no right to do it, and I called her on it.
- Chall: Now, let's see. Gladys O'Donnell was running for--
- Hosmer: National federation president. That was '68.
- Chall: In 1968 against Phyllis Schlafly?
- Hosmer: Yes. Phyllis Schlafly was the first vice-president in the national, but the Rockefeller forces couldn't let her and her conservatives get in. So, they on the national committee did what they could to . . . Boy, they just pulled every unparliamentary thing that you could imagine. They stacked the seats; they stacked everything. It was really a shocking experience for me. [chuckle] I learned a lot of things that time.

But, anyhow, she was the one that wanted to run for president.

Chall: Henriette Steinegger wanted to run for--?

Hosmer: No. Raymonde Thielle, for me, originally--

Chall: Wanted to run for Northern Division.

Hosmer: Yes. But I can't remember whether she did or they convinced her that she couldn't get it against me. I don't remember which way it went. Is she still alive?

Chall: I think so. I'm not sure though. Well, these women, then, have their friendships and contacts that have meaning throughout the federation and the party itself for over long periods of time.

Hosmer: Oh, sure. Sure. Oh, yes. Some of them do. I have many friends from my work in the federation.

Chall: And the lines get drawn every now and then.

Hosmer: Yes, the lines get drawn, of course. Henriette and Raymonde were much more liberal than I, and Ardis Myhrs and Gladys Penland and I were more conservative than they were, basically. Elsa Sandstrom was more conservative than Henriette, and we were working for Phyllis Schlafly, and they were working for Gladys O'Donnell. Phyllis got 85% of the vote of the women from California because Gladys was not that popular. That was one of the things, though, that was, and she had a lot of money and she used it. She sued me for something I said in the state board.

Chall: Sued you? In court?

Hosmer: She was going to go to court. It was a harrassment and a threat. I made the point that she had made some statements publicly in a newspaper against Phyllis which were not true, and I said if that was the beginning of her campaign, it was deplorable that she would start that way. And so she sued me. I sent a copy of the letter I wrote to her to the other members of the--[board?]

William Knowland and the 1958 Gubernatorial Campaign ##

[Interview 5: December 5, 1976]

Hosmer: I'm going to have to go back in my memory.

Chall: Oh, this goes back a long way.

Chall: I guess people have been wondering for years, and I don't know that anybody has the exact answer yet, as to what would have prompted William Knowland to run for governor at that time when he had a secure seat in the Senate, and to have created this incredible upset throughout the state in the Republican party and really lose to the Democrats what the Republicans had had statewide up to that time. Have you any idea what that might have been?

Hosmer: Oh, there were rumors all over the place. I don't have any idea how accurate they are. I had heard somewhere along the line that the Edison Electric people didn't like Goody [Goodwin] Knight, and he was not [chuckle] exactly terribly stable, you know. He kind of "listeth with the wind," you know, and Knowland was a solid, forthright individual. But I don't think he always got all the nuances of things that were going on around him.

Chall: Knowland?

Hosmer: Yes. I know he told me one time that he had nothing to do with the ousting of Knight, that that had already been arranged, and that the powers that be would not have allowed him to run; he wasn't even in the state when it happened, and they asked him to step in.

Chall: The powers that be just didn't want Knight to run, is that it?

Hosmer: That's it, yes. You see, Knight had an unhappy faculty. I know personally of two or three lawyers to whom he promised judgeships, and it was the same judgeship. He did that a number of times, you see, and so there was considerable turmoil because of the things that he did. He wasn't a wise man in any way. He was a likable man. He was a tremendous speaker, and if he liked you, you were just great; but if he didn't like you, heaven help you. He really carried grudges very deeply.

But I was on the periphery of the campaign. I was in charge of the campaign from Monterey to the Oregon border. We had a bus tour into all the small towns in all the counties along the way. I went there with Helen Knowland and the two girls. We went to just about every county. It was quite a deal, you know, because we had to have a tour, and we had to have people to meet us in each community where we went, and we had to be able to know how long it took to get from one place to another, and the whole bit. Then you're responsible for the people on the bus, and responsible for getting the people off of the bus in the length of time they should, and then back on the bus as soon as they should so we could get to the next stop in time.

Chall: Like the old whistle-stop campaigning on the train.

Hosmer: Exactly.

Chall: And you did this by a bus?

Hosmer: We did it by a big bus.

Chall: A big bus. Doing it the same way.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: You were responsible, as I understand it, for--you were Northern California women's chairman.

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: And so, on this trip, was this primarily to seek out and work with women?

Hosmer: No, no.

Chall: Or was this for all--?

Hosmer: Well, we expected the women in each community to gather the faithful, you know, wherever we'd stop, and bring people to hear what we had to say.

Helen Knowland was a very charming woman, and she made a very good appearance, and she is very intelligent. The girls were nice, and they were fun. It was a nice group. Gladys O'Donnell was with us on the trip; she was state chairman.

Chall: I see. You were expecting the women to "gather the faithful," as you say, but that wasn't--

Hosmer: At the meeting place.

Chall: That was not just women, but men and women?

Hosmer: Men and women, yes, in their communities. We'd have lunches at one place, breakfasts at another place, dinners at another place, and that's the way we went, and we covered the territory.

We had some funny experiences on that trip. We went way up into the cow country, you know, way up there, to a town called Likely.

Chall: A town called Likely?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: That's a likely name. [chuckle]

Hosmer: An unlikely name. [chuckle]

Anyhow, there they had a huge, huge thing. It was in ranch country, and they had this great big ranch there. We came in, and here was this beautiful table with a great big bowl of orange juice and things like that, we thought--I thought--and it was hot, you know. So, they handed me a glass of orange juice, and I took a big gulp, and ooh! I wasn't used to drinking [laugh], and here it burned all the way down; there was vodka in it. And I turned back to see them pouring a square bottle of vodka into the thing. Well, I didn't have any more of that. I didn't even know they did things like that.

Chall: By "hot," do you mean well spiked, or was it a mulled drink?

Hosmer: Well-spiked.

Chall: It wasn't warm, it wasn't heated by heat?

Hosmer: Just by the vodka! [laughter] You know, there's no flavor, no taste or anything to it, but if it's in there, you can feel the warmth going down your gizzard. [laughter] So, that's exactly what happened.

Then we went up to another town where we couldn't get them to sit down and eat dinner. Cow counties are something. They're really something to try to corral. [chuckle] You run into some stra-a-a-ange situations in those things.

Then we went up to a little town called--well, it's the other side of Mt. Shasta--where they had fried bread. They made fried bread. They made fresh bread, and then they'd dip it, and they'd serve it with strawberries and cream. We went up there for breakfast.

Chall: My word! How unusual.

Hosmer: That's the way they did it. They're quite unique in those areas.

But it was an interesting experience, and we covered a lot of territory. I got to know a lot of people, and so it was good from that point of view.

And then, of course, we had big affairs for him down here. He always came across very well. But the thing that killed him--and that was his advisers; that was Edison Company and some of those bigwigs--was his taking on the right-to-work as part of his platform, you know. [Proposition 18] Merritt, my husband, said, "Boy, he really is such a blankety-blank idiot. Why didn't he keep his mouth shut till he got in?" [laughs] But that's the thing that killed him, because the unions came in here by the busload, the state of

Hosmer: California, and they had busloads of union people out in the precincts, in every precinct in California. And then when they got through here, they went up to Alaska, and did the same thing up there for their election.

Chall: Well, that was to be expected, I suppose, that they would fight.

Hosmer: But that was the reason that there was such a situation.

Chall: I understand that Knowland himself, according to one account, campaigned in the state only about maybe fourteen days, that his wife, as you indicated, did most of the campaigning.

Hosmer: Well, of course, he was still in the Senate at the time.

Chall: Yes.

Hosmer: I don't know that it was that small a time. It seemed to me he was in a lot longer than that.

Chall: Yes. Mrs. Knowland, it has been said, distributed literature, and among the literature was a pamphlet by Joseph Kamp, who had long been identified as what some people would consider an extremist; at least he was far to the right. He was with the Constitutional Educational League. This, apparently, was considered not a very good tactic. She also sent out some 200 letters castigating Knight for having a "spaghetti spine."* You get the feeling that Mrs. Knowland was really working very hard on this campaign, and, well, sometimes it seems somewhat hysterically. I'm just wondering whether that was poor advice too. Do you recall this sort of thing, or how she felt about what she was doing?

Hosmer: I don't remember her ever accusing Knight of having a "spaghetti spine." I've heard other people make that comment, because he usually went with the last person he would talk to. So, he could very well have had that reputation, because I heard that a great deal.

Chall: That phrase.

Hosmer: Yes. The phrase was more that whoever talked to him last got him swayed his way. You'd think he was set on something, and then the next thing you knew, he'd flop clearly over to the other side of the fence, that way.

*J. Totton Anderson, "The 1958 Election in California," Western Political Quarterly, March, 1959: 276-300.

Hosmer: But as far as Kamp is concerned, I've read him. I know the man; I've read his stuff. But I don't remember its being a portion, an approved pamphlet, of the campaign.

Chall: It may not have been approved, but she may have used it anyway. Some things aren't approved.

Hosmer: Well, I don't--

Chall: You don't recall seeing it?

Hosmer: I don't recall seeing it. It wasn't something we distributed on our trip, because I would have remembered it, because he was kind of a rabble-rouser.

Chall: Kamp?

Hosmer: As I remember. It's been so long. My God. I just remember the name and I remember the--it was Constitutional Government or something like that.

Chall: Yes. Let's see. Constitutional Educational League.

Hosmer: Yes. They always have such nice names, don't they?

Chall: Yes. Now, this was a campaign also that some writers feel made use of a great deal of smear tactics. The research committee of the Los Angeles County Federation of Republican Women is supposed to have prepared a piece of campaign literature contrasting the records of [Bradford] Trenham and Richard Richards who were running for the state senate. It was supposed to have been a piece of smear literature. Would you have been aware of the research committee of the Los Angeles County Federation of Republican Women putting out a thing of this kind?*

Hosmer: It may have been Gladys O'Donnell. She was president of it at that time.

Chall: Yes. She was president of--well, let's see. Somebody was president of the Southern Division, and I don't have her name.

Hosmer: Of Southern Division. Well, Gladys was in for a few months. There was a short period of time when she was in. But, I mean, she was the campaign chairman for Knowland.

*Anderson, "The 1958 Election in California," p. 298, n. 47.

Chall: She was the campaign chairman for Knowland?

Hosmer: Yes. The state women's chairman.

Chall: Oh, state women, yes.

Hosmer: Well, the women did the work, as always. They always did. I'm going to get some hot tea.

Chall: According to these lists that I got from you, the president of the California Federation of Republican Women at that time was Mrs. Kenyon. So, it's possible that Mrs. O'Donnell was the southern president?*

Hosmer: Yes, she could have been.

Chall: I see.

Hosmer: And Mrs. Kenyon's husband was the president of Edison Electric down south.

Chall: Oh. They had a nice tie-in.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: I see. Well, so, you really think that Southern Edison had quite a bit to do with this.

Hosmer: They had an awful lot to do with it, financewise and everything else, I'm sure of it. She was like a steamroller; you got in her way, and it's just that you got flattened out. And she had the power behind her. It makes a lot of difference when somebody like--when O'Donnell was president, you know, and she had her oil millions and things like that.

Chall: O'Donnell was part of an oil--her husband was oil?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. She was it.

Chall: Oh, she was oil, yes. [short interruption to get water for tea]

Hosmer: I was not aware at that time, as I became later. May I give some to you? [interruption to serve tea]

Chall: You say you became later more aware of. . .

*Southern Division president, 1957-1959 was Iola Petty (Mrs. Don Petty).

Hosmer: I got in closer in the more inner circles.

Chall: And then became aware of what?

Hosmer: Of more of the machinations that went on. You know, when you first go into these things, you just take things at their face value because you're very naive. I ain't that way no more! [laughter] I got over that!

Chall: Well, at that time you were--

Hosmer: But at that time I was what? I was Northern Division president?

Chall: Yes, you were.

Hosmer: It was later that I became state president. Then I got a little closer to some of it.

Chall: Yes. In the next campaign, you were not just working with the women, so that that makes some difference. Although as women's chairman in this campaign, you must have been cutting right across the whole party.

Hosmer: Oh, yes. Sure. Sure, I did.

Chall: Up and down the northern part of the state at least, because the women were organizing the campaign.

Hosmer: They always did. That was one of the things that the Republicans had that the Democrats did not have because they didn't have a Democrat women's organization at that time.

Chall: Not outside the party structure.

Hosmer: No. They were controlled by each county central committee, and there was just no organization at all.

Chall: Now, how did you work with the state women's division's vice-chairman?

Hosmer: Well, you see, I was also a member of the state central committee and the county central committee. I was vice-chairman of the county central committee, and I was an officer of the state central committee. So, you see, I was tied in on all sides.

Chall: I see. So, they worked with you.

Hosmer: Yes.

women, as you recall it, upset by what
 the Knowland and Knight? Even the
 Senator?-- It was a conflict here,

was the party?

primary endorsements; you see That was a
 one of the things that we insisted upon
 with the precinct workers, we were the workers
 it out and endorsed prior to the primary,
 is five days to Sunday. So for that reason,
 vice-presidents were allowed to make any
 for the other. Once we had the situation

the early Goldwater men and women got their
 The moderates and the conservative
 has said, promptly those sides when

say on that would maybe have been the
 need of being part of the China Lobby.

in fact.

Ch: yes,
 speaking of

Ch: that was

mer: The Goldwater

Ch: Men's group
 were a little
 to this.

mer: Ch: yes.

Ch: Yes. You
 aware that
 Ch.

Hosmer: No, I don't think so.

Chall: Well, if you had had your druthers at that time--would you have gone through this bit with the Republican party, pulling Knowland away from the Senate and into a campaign of this kind?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: This wouldn't have been your way to bring up the Republican party?

Hosmer: No, no. That, to me, was asking for trouble.

Chall: With or without the right-to-work issue?

Hosmer: Yes. Well, the right-to-work issue destroyed the whole campaign. A lot of us fought like tigers to keep it out of the campaign. But Mrs. Kenyon and Mrs. O'Donnell were for it, and those were the forces that we were fighting, and that's what destroyed him.

Chall: I have some notes on the right-to-work issue here. I guess that state convention--I don't know whether you can remember it or not, but it must have been pretty exciting. The state convention leaders at the August 2-3 convention tried to keep an open break from occurring over the right-to-work issue, and they managed, after a very sharp floor fight, I understand, to keep--

Hosmer: To keep it off.

Chall: To keep it off. But there was a tacit understanding that the candidates were free to campaign for or against it, and I guess, as you say, the Knowland people fought for it; that was the advice.* He didn't keep it out of his campaign.

Hosmer: [softly] That was the stupidest thing that ever happened.

Chall: I see. Do you recall anything about that particular--?

Hosmer: No, I really don't. I've been through so many of those fights. [laughter] Every time there's a campaign, there are issues and everybody is pulling each other's hair out, figuratively if not literally. [chuckle]

*William Knowland asked the state central committee convention delegates to take no official stand pro or con on the right-to-work initiative. Sacramento Bee, August 2, 1958.

- Chall: I see. Knight wouldn't take a stand on that. In fact, he apparently felt that it was a poor issue, as he would, and even Nixon and Eisenhower apparently spoke actually against it.
- Hosmer: Well, that's what I said. It was the powers that be in the top of Knowland's campaign that demanded it. That's why Knowland--
- Chall: Yes. And when the major newspapers towards the end came out opposing Knowland, I guess then you all knew he'd had it.
- Hosmer: Oh, there was no doubt. He was a strange mixture, that man.
- Chall: I know. And I'd like a little bit of background on him, since we're going to have to get it from other people rather than from him himself. You have known him.
- Hosmer: Since about '56. --
- Chall: Yes. He used to come here and talk.
- Hosmer: Talk to me, yes.
- Chall: What was your general impression of him?
- Hosmer: Well, I always rather admired the man, and I always thought that he had the courage of his convictions, and I always thought he was sincere in what he was doing. But as the years went by, I began to wonder just how shrewd his judgements were. In many cases, I thought they were excellent. Of course, you see, that's a matter of personal opinion with things like that.
- Chall: Yes. Right.
- Hosmer: But I always felt that he was a sincere person and was doing what he thought was the right thing to do, but I think he was manipulated.
- Chall: In this?
- Hosmer: Yes, in this particular thing, because that was his financial backing. They were determined on this right-to-work. Of all the stupid, asinine things to do to that man. Hanging an albatross like that around his neck. It brought union members out from under the trees and the rocks and everything else.
- Chall: Yes. Knight did have, had had, union support.
- Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And the Republican platform had favored the union shop, so that all of this created a considerable change in party philosophy.

Hosmer: Yes. Well, the right-to-work has always been a hot issue. I remember the time it first came up a lot of people believed it should be state by state if they wanted it. They figured that this other would make the unions too powerful, and it did, even if they didn't get the right-to-work in. And now, you see, they spent--what did they spend? About five or six million dollars to elect people this year, about three times as much as anybody else.

Chall: The unions?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: So, your opinion of Knowland was generally a good one? Except that he didn't exercise proper judgement all the time?

Hosmer: I think he was influenced by the people he was sure. . . I think if he accepted a person as his friend, he trusted him. I think that was the kind of man he was, and I think his end was the saddest thing I've ever heard in my life. I never was sure that he really did himself in. A lot of people have not been sure of that.

Chall: I see. Do you think he might have been murdered?

Hosmer: Yes. A lot of people felt that way.

Chall: At the time that you knew him, was his [marital] relationship a good one? He and his wife were both interested in politics together?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. For years.

Chall: She was interested in his work in Washington?

Hosmer: Yes, very much so.

Chall: What happened to him after 1958? Did he generally disappear from party functions?

Hosmer: Well, he took over--you see, his father was very old, and his younger brother was not capable of running the [Oakland] Tribune, so he took it over and went back and worked as a publisher.

Chall: I see. Did he have any more contact or influence with the Republican party?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. Sure. He was always almost the titular head of the party in California for years. He was always a welcome speaker everywhere, except some particular areas where I think there was a lot of friction between him and Christopher, because they were on opposite sides and opposed. Of course, San Francisco is always ultra-liberal. That's why I was so flabbergasted when Reagan got 67% of their vote up there. I nearly collapsed from shock. [chuckle]

Chall: In this last primary?

Hosmer: Yes, yes. That was an amazing thing. Of course, he's a wonderful speaker, Reagan is.

Chall: Reagan, yes. He is a good speaker, no question about it.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Well, so, the Republicans really lost that election in grand style.

Hosmer: Yes, they lost that one. Well, they never do anything halfway. [chuckle] Whichever way they go.

Chall: I wanted to ask you, if you can recall it, about the Republican Associates, because in 1958 they organized in this county, and there seemed to be some problem about this. They were opposed to the "new way," a reorganization of the CRA into small units in each county. The newspaper indicated that this was a split into conservative factions. Did you ever belong to the Republican Associates?

Hosmer: No. The only thing I remember about the Republican Associates [is that] I was vice-chairman of the county central committee when they came before us, and that was Jim Halley who came before us; that was long before he was a member. They came before us to get permission to organize in the county, and I supported that they wanted to do it because most of the Republican Associates were businessmen who were well established. Some were conservative, and some were liberal, but they were just the good, solid type of individual that generally speaking you would expect to be very helpful in their work; I mean, in their support.

So, I saw no reason to refuse to give them the right to organize. They weren't cutting across the lines of any of the other groups. They had different goals and different purposes, but the ultimate goal was for the benefit of the party.

Chall: The organization still exists?

Hosmer: As far as I know, yes. It was really a men's group; a businessmen's group was the way it originally organized.

Chall: I see. Yes. And therefore it would have to cut across the boundaries of the CRA if they were being organized into county units.

Hosmer: Oh, sure. Yes. But the CRA was men and women; it was a different kind of organization entirely.

III CALIFORNIA AND THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, 1976

[Interview 4: September 14, 1976]

Chall: What I thought we ought to do today is to forget about the basic chronological way that we have been working and talk about the 1976 Republican convention that you've just returned from so that we could get not only a fresh view of it from you when it's still in your mind, but we might then compare it with a few others that you went to. So, we can go back to the convention of 1960, which is your first, and 1964, and 1968. Did you go in 1972?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: All right. Then we could talk about those conventions and sort of compare them with the 1976. Then what I'll probably do is to go back and pick up other threads of those campaign years. But if you can make this kind of comparison, it might be just as well to do it today.

Hosmer: Okay. [tape off during brief interruption]

Chall: Now, in terms of comparisons, since you went to the 1960, '64, '68, and 76 conventions, let's start with your impressions of 1976, and occasionally I may just interrupt you and see whether we can make comparison to the others, too.

Background, 1960

Chall: But there is one question that I want to ask you about going in 1960 that bothers me. In 1960, if my material is correct, weren't you the outgoing president of the federation's Northern Division?

Hosmer: Outgoing with Northern Division, ingoing with the state.

Chall: Then how could it be that you could be a delegate to the Republican convention, when in effect that means the primary; that means taking a position prior to the general election?

Hosmer: Because of the fact they had no contestant.

Chall: I see. As long as it's not contested--

Hosmer: Yes. Normally it's not contested, and if it's a Californian, you see, you generally support the person from California.

Chall: And Nixon was the favorite son?

Hosmer: He was the favorite son. That's the best way to answer it. If you have a favorite son candidate--I'm not even sure that at that time that we had that rule. It seems to me that that rule came along back in--[pauses to think] When was it? I think the national bylaws were changed, whether in '64 or '68, because the national organization found it split the federation.

Chall: Yes, I would think so.

Hosmer: So, I think that was it. But it seems to me that in '60--I wouldn't want to say that for sure; I think I could check it out and verify it for you.

But the fact was we had a favorite son candidate. It made all the difference. The chairman of our delegation was Senator Kuchel, you see, and I was secretary of the delegation at that time.

Chall: You must have been, of course, quite active, because not too many women are ever appointed delegates.

Hosmer: Well, the powers that be among the men in the party were beginning to recognize the fact that without the work of the volunteer groups such as the federation. . . You see, when I went in, we had 58,000 members, and when I went out we had 63,000. I had done the same sort of job in the Northern Division, so I did have a reputation of being a good organizer. I also was county precinct chairman. I was on the state central committee; I had been on the state central committee since 1948.

So, I was active in just about every phase, because the county committees, you see, are responsible for precinct work, and I conducted schools of politics up and down--remember I told you?--in Northern Division; that's when I first started it, training people to do precinct work and handle campaign issues and things like that. So, it was because of my know-how, as well as my status.

Hosmer: As a state president, you see, I automatically became a member of the national board. So, because of that I was valuable, because if you have some acquaintances nationally then you can contact members of other delegations.

Chall: Yes. So, you were a key woman.

Hosmer: So, I was a key person at that point. But, of course, nobody did much key work except Marjorie Benedict! [laughter] She was the national committeewoman and she was the top. And then, of course, it's really a party thing, you see. It wasn't a federation deal; it was a party organization. So, your national committeewoman from the state and your vice-chairman--that would be like Jane Zimmerman and people of that kind, north and south and central--they worked with the women of the Republican--we had a women's division of the Republican National Committee. So, they worked together, and so it was really party.

But as a state president, I was given a lot of, you know, honorary things to do, and receptions, and hostessing, and I was invited to the front parties, shall I say, where people were included. So, that was the thing, the way it was.

Chall: That's the reason you were picked. And, as I understand it, in 1960 Nixon had carefully picked a delegation that was representative of most of the party.

Hosmer: Yes, he tried to get a good cross section, conservatives and moderates and liberals. Of course, that's always the whole focus. I mean, that's why I was so shocked when people got so excited about [Richard] Schweiker. It's just geographically and philosophically--it was a pragmatic approach, of course. But when you consider the small percentage of conservatives in the party, it was a very sensible move. And it's interesting to me that they say Schweiker may be in trouble, but he says he's going to have a more moderate approach in his voting record because he's so impressed with some of the things that Reagan did in California, and he thinks perhaps that the private sector can do a better job and much cheaper than the federal government. Of course, we could have told him that a long time ago. [laughs]

Chall: [laughter] You've got a convert!

Hosmer: [laughter] And I never expected it. Anyhow it's one good thing that came out.

Chall: In appointing you secretary in 1960--

Hosmer: Well, that was just to keep me happy because I was the state president of the Republican women.

Chall: Is there much work attached to being the secretary, or is it an honorarium?

Hosmer: It really is more an honorarium. They had a regular teletype [stenotypist?] to do the--

Chall: For keeping the records?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. They have to keep the records. It's federal law, or maybe it's state. It could be state and it also could be--what would it be under? National committee. There would have to be a record in to the national committee for that for all of those things so they'd have an absolutely accurate record. It was just a nice thing to let me sit up there and look important, you know. I didn't realize it as much then as I do now! [laughs]

Chall: Well, you learn by doing. [laughter]

Hosmer: You sure do! A good deal. [laughs]

Chall: Even though learning costs nothing. [laughter]

This was the first year, 1960, that Marjorie Benedict, after a long term as national committeewoman, was replaced. Now, was that because Joseph Martin was from the north and it was necessary to pick a southerner?

Hosmer: Yes. Well, it still is. I mean, it's always been that balance; if the man is from the north, the woman has to be from the south. That's when Pat Hitt went in, isn't it?

Chall: Yes, that's right.

Hosmer: Of course, national committeewoman and national committeeman require quite considerable funding, and both Joseph Martin and Pat Hitt had it. Her father, Riley, was extremely wealthy.

Chall: Was there any opposition to Pat Hitt?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: That it might have been somebody else? Another woman?

Hosmer: No, not from down there. Of course, there were some that would have loved to have had it, but she was very close to Nixon. She and Bob Finch always worked very closely together. She's always worked very hard for Bob Finch, and at that time Finch was his campaign manager, so that's how that came about.

But she's an extremely intelligent gal. Have you talked to her yet?

Chall: Not yet, no.

Hosmer: She's a very intelligent person, very charming, very capable, and she always mends her fences, because we've been on opposite sides of battles at different times and we've never had any recriminations. When Phyllis Schlafly ran against Gladys O'Donnell--she's an old friend of Gladys's, you know--and so there was quite a bit of controversy there between us, not individually but because of who we happened to be supporting.

But I've always respected Pat and I've admired her for the job she did. She just didn't go in there because she had money. That was a help, of course, because it costs a lot of money for entertaining and things like that.

Chall: How about her approach as differentiated from Marjorie Benedict's? Was there much difference?

Hosmer: Much more inclusive.

Chall: How do you mean?

Hosmer: Well, she was much more inclined to delegate authority to other women and bring more women into it in other capacities. That was always Marjorie's problem. She was all right about letting them to it at the local level, but if they got up above that then it was always a threat to her.

Chall: What place is there above the local level? That and the state vice-chairmanship.

Hosmer: That and then the national, you see. There's always the threat of replacement, because Marjorie had been in it nearly twenty years. Of course, as long as Bill Knowland was in, she was the white-headed girl, so to speak. I have been told and it was alleged, you know, that the [Oakland] Tribune funded it, because she personally. . . I'm sure her husband wouldn't have the funds and she didn't.

Chall: But this is not unusual.

Hosmer: No. It was a very common practice throughout the country. Up until--let's see. Generally speaking, that's the way it worked.

Chall: Some members of the party had to sustain others.

Hosmer: Yes, somebody somewhere along, whether it was the finance people or what.

Chall: I still wonder if you can tell me how Patricia Hitt delegated responsibility more than Mrs. Benedict. At what levels?

Hosmer: State. You see, the national committee is responsible for elections to the Congress, the Senate, and the president's campaign. So, she was--how shall I put it? She not only delegated or supported people who she'd like to see in as vice-chairmen, because they'd be the three people in the state who would work with her, but where campaigns were concerned she would be the one who would have to give the approval to a state chairman or the northern division chairman or the southern or the central for campaigns, you see. They were all tied in together. Not the final complete say, but she would also help to choose the steering committee for the state for national campaigns, which would include the congressmen and the senators and the presidential campaign.

Chall: This would be the role of the national committeewoman?

Hosmer: Her recommendation. And they wouldn't often go against whom she wanted, unless they were officers or presidents, you see. You see, having been a member of volunteer groups, she recognized the benefit that we had from those women for the work they did, and their knowledge, their studies of issues and campaigns and things like that. So, she helped to build people so that they could come up to being a national committeewoman.

Then at that time we did limit the terms to two terms, so, you see, the national committeewoman could only have two terms, no more. And we recommended, of course, that it should be only one term, because there are three divisions and leadership in each three of the areas.

Chall: You recommended that the national committeewoman have only one term?

Hosmer: One term. That's four years.

Chall: Did this become a state law?

Hosmer: Not state law, but it was a ruling of the state organization for California committeewomen. I don't know whether the national committee ever made it a law or not. We had the same thing in Ohio. There was a woman in Ohio who had that job for twenty-five years. So, you know, you just lose. Women can go here [gestures], but they have nothing more to look forward to.

Chall: I see. So, was this done, do you think, in the central committee?

Hosmer: In the state central, yes.

Chall: Did this pertain also to men, or was it just to women?

Hosmer: I think it was for both. Yes, I think they'd have to.

Chall: I would think so.

Hosmer: I would think so. I know that it was changed after Marjorie, you see.

Chall: Yes, I noticed that it was a one-term--

Hosmer: That was a one-term deal because they figured four years was enough. In fact, they made a change in our national committeewoman at this [1976] convention.

Chall: Yes. Whom did they pick this time?

Hosmer: Virginia--[trying to think of her last name] Oh, for heaven's sake!

Chall: I couldn't find it in the daily newspaper.

Hosmer: She was the vice-chairman in central.

Chall: Not Virginia Brock?

Hosmer: No, no. There are two Virginias. She's from down in the central division. [looking through papers to locate name] I'll think of it. I know her name perfectly well.

Chall: Well, I saw Mike Curb's name in the newspapers, but I didn't see any reference to the national committeewoman, which seems to be--I hate to say "par for the course," but it is a little difficult to find the name of the woman.

Hosmer: It is.

Chall: Nobody seems to pay any attention.

Hosmer: Well, of course, Elsa Sandstrom was the national committeewoman until the end of the convention.

Chall: Yes. And then the delegates--

Hosmer: Then the delegates selected--we selected our officers at our first meeting.

Chall: But you don't select the committeeman and committeewoman at the first meeting?

Hosmer: We nominate. They nominate, but it has to be confirmed by the whole body.

[searching through papers] Isn't that funny. Her name ought to be in here some place.

Chall: Well, maybe we'll find it.

Hosmer: [locates name] Rice. Virginia Rice. And she's from down in--it's way down. I want to say Visalia, but it's not that.

Chall: In the Central Valley?

Hosmer: It's in central. It's the central division. [looking at map] Mariposa. Stanislaus.

Chall: Well, maybe you will find that.

Hosmer: She was county chairman. She was her county's chairman [Republican central committee], and she was in Republican women.

Chall: She was also an officer of the California Federation, Central Division?

Hosmer: [trying to remember where Virginia Rice was from] Stanislaus? Isn't that sad.

Chall: And who is Mike Curb?

Hosmer: Mike Curb was Reagan's chairman for the state, and Elsa Sandstrom was women's chairman for the state for Reagan.

[still trying to remember the city] I can dig out one of my old rosters if I can't remember it.

Chall: Well, maybe you could go ahead then and you could find that for me later. It's not very often that a person from the Central Valley is given that position.

Hosmer: Well, there's not that many people over there. There's not that much of an organization. She was down near Porterville, down that way, and that's quite a ways down. Hanford? No, that wasn't it. Well, I'll check it, because I've got the--

Chall: You'll find it and let me know. When we're editing, you'll probably find it.* Now we can go on.

That year it was not a favorite son delegation. This was a delegation that won through the fire of the primary.

*Virginia Rice is from Hanford, Kings County.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And that makes a difference, doesn't it, when you go back committed after winning the primary.

Hosmer: Yes.

Background, 1964

Chall: And this had been done in '64 when Goldwater won?

Hosmer: That's right. I was on that [delegation] because I went out in '63 as state president. So, you see, I was eligible.

Chall: I see. Had you ever thought of going on as national president, or had you thought of it and dropped the idea?

Hosmer: I thought of it for both of them, but my husband wasn't the type.

Chall: Was that as far as he wanted you to go?

Hosmer: Well, he was unhappy when I stayed on for three years, because, you know, you do an awful lot of traveling and you are away from home. But the other thing, he just didn't want me to do it, because that would have meant--national president or national committeewoman--national committeewoman would be doing more traveling back and forth across the country.

National president would mean living there. You know, if you're going to do a proper job, you have to move to Washington. And if you had children--unless you have a husband like Pat Hitt's husband. He went back to Washington with her, you see. He was able to move around and do it. But when your business is right where you live, it can't be done, and you have to make a choice. And so although Gladys O'Donnell was sure I was going to run against her, I never had any intention of doing it.

Chall: At what point had you even considered or been considered for national committeewoman?

Hosmer: It was in '64.

Chall: Oh, 1964?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: But then Gardiner Johnson, who comes from the north--

Hosmer: From the north, yes.

Chall: You wouldn't have had a chance anyway.

Hosmer: Well, because he and Knowland were just like that. [makes gesture indicating closeness] They were buddies. In fact, the Knowlands were at Gardiner Johnson's wedding; I mean, they were that close. And if Gardiner wanted it, and naturally he would, that's the way it would go, and Marjorie was for him. She wouldn't have stood still for a woman from the north.

Chall: As a matter of fact, no woman from the north has had it until just--

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: Who?

Hosmer: Well--

Chall: Well, Elsa Sandstrom is basically northern, isn't she?

Hosmer: Yes, she's from--she's up at Stonyford. But it's much the other way now. The men had a much better--

Chall: Do the men get picked first? I mean, do they pick the man first and then the woman?

Hosmer: That's the way I understand it. It always has been.

Chall: You've seen it happen. [chuckle]

Hosmer: Yes, I've seen it happen. [chuckle]

Gardiner Johnson is a very smart man. You know, there are different types. Joe Martin is--I don't know.

Chall: Well, Martin, as I understand it, was fairly liberal.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: That is, he was a Rockefeller man when the time came.

Hosmer: Oh, yes. Oh, he was a Rockefeller man from the word go, and Gardiner Johnson was the other extreme, which didn't make it a bit easier!
[laughs]

Chall: It doesn't help you either way.

Hosmer: Well, it wasn't that. It's just the character and the personality of the people involved, you know.

Chall: Regardless of their stand on issues.

Hosmer: Regardless of their stand on issues. Some of the people you work with are easier to work with. [laughs]

Chall: Yes. Was Joseph Martin easier for you to work with, say, than Gardiner Johnson, in personality?

Hosmer: Their personalities were completely and totally different, and I didn't have too much to do with Martin. I had more to do with Gardiner Johnson, because I was working for Goldwater, than I would with Rockefeller, and I never cottoned to him at all.

Chall: To Mr. Johnson?

Hosmer: To Rockefeller. So, it made a difference. The only times really that I had much contact with Joe Martin was at the state central committee meetings, and as you said, it was a mixed delegation at that time. [1960] He knew where I stood and I knew where he stood. But he was always very nice and he was always a gentleman. I'll say that for him; he always was good.

Gardiner looked upon me as competition in the Goldwater campaign, so there's a difference.

Chall: Oh, really?

Hosmer: Oh, yes!

Chall: In what way could you have been competition?

Hosmer: I was a member of the National Draft Goldwater Committee long before it ever came to California.

Chall: I see. And before Johnson took hold of it?

Hosmer: Yes. Before he went after it. [laughs]

Chall: Yes. Well, some were coming along a little later.

Hosmer: [laughs heartily]

Chall: I want to get into the history of that, but not today. I think today we'll talk about the conventions, if it's possible to talk about them without going into the background.

Hosmer: Yes. [laughing heartily] All right. It's all in the club. [tape off briefly for telephone interruption]

The California Delegation, 1976

Chall: Well, tell me about the 1976 convention. You were all elected here with, I guess, great hopes. Did you really go thinking that it was close enough so that you might win, or did you have some ideas that it wouldn't be easy?

Hosmer: I had some definite ideas. I knew it wouldn't be easy. I thought it would be a miracle, frankly, because I could see the signs, you see.

The national committee was controlled by [President Gerald R.] Ford and his people, and it wasn't a national convention; it was a Ford convention. There wasn't one Reagan person on the platform. There was not one Reagan person as a speaker. The chairman, [John] Rhodes, didn't recognize Reagan people on the floor. It was a replay of the '68 fight we had in the federation when Rockefeller came in and people came in and took over.

I was on the Credentials Committee, and I got a notice of a Credentials Committee meeting at 3:30 in the afternoon, and the meeting had started at 3:00, clear over on the other side of the state.

Chall: Of the state or the city?

Hosmer: Of the state. Kansas City is right on the line of Missouri, in Missouri, and then Kansas is just over the line. But it was a half an hour away from where our hotel was. They had shuttlebuses, but none of them were running that afternoon to go to the meeting.

I got to the meeting, and I went up and found out who the chairman was. I had a friend who lived in Kansas City; that's the only way I got to the meeting. And I went up and asked him why I hadn't been notified, and he said, well, he didn't know. I said, "Where does the buck stop?" [laughs] And he said, "Well, I didn't know anything about that." I said, "Well, why wouldn't you? You're the chairman."

Then we had a couple of resolutions brought up. Nobody knew anything about them, and the thing was stacked, and they voted their way. Then I learned later that there had been other meetings where credentials had been challenged and none of the Reagan people had been notified of the challenging.

Hosmer: So, that's why I felt the way I did when I came back, because the whole thing was so wrong. People who looked at it on the TV said they could tell. In fact, one of the newscasters back in Kansas City said that Ford got the nomination, but Reagan got the coronation.

Then they started talking about unity, and somebody asked me--oh, dear, I'll have to tell you about that. And I said, "Well, it's nice to talk about it, after you've been stabbed in the back, knifed in the back, a half a dozen times."

They turned off the microphone, turned the microphone down, so that the delegates couldn't even hear what the resolutions were they were voting on. Nobody could complain because nobody would listen. It was really a stacked deal!

Chall: I understand that conventions are sometimes like that.

Hosmer: Oh, yes.

Chall: But I just wondered whether this was the first time you had been aware of these types of background activities?

Hosmer: Well, the other times, you've got to remember, we had--even with the Goldwater thing, the convention, they had such a preponderance, but they did everything under the sun to him, but not at the convention. They tried to do it at the convention too, and they had some real knock. . . We had some people come in with guns and threaten us at that '64 convention.

Chall: Oh, is that right?

Hosmer: Oh, yes! There was no publicity about it in the papers at all, but we, right down there in front. . . It's interesting to compare '76 to '64. We had our delegates right up in the front of the hall [in 1964]. In '76, the California delegation was the very last in the back of the hall, as far back as they could get us, and Texas was the same way in the other end of the hall. [chuckle] You heard our "Viva and [could not hear]." That was our daily signal to each other.

North Carolina tried to get the eye of the chairman to demand roll call votes on some of the resolutions, you know, on 16C and some of the other things, and they wouldn't recognize them. Finally, at the very last, he kept hollering--he almost lost his voice. He finally got the floor on something else where they thought it was going to be unanimous, and he proceeded to tell them off in no uncertain terms about how they had turned off the microphones, and how they had refused to recognize him, and so on and so forth. And they were very sorry.

Chall: You mean the chairman? He said he was sorry?

Hosmer: Well, the chairman and the powers that be. No, he didn't say they were sorry. He was sorry that he had even let him talk that time.

Chall: Oh, I see.

Hosmer: When I was going up the stairs after the vote, I had a microphone stuck in my face and they asked me how I felt about it, you know, and I just said, "It was the worst stacked deck I've ever seen." [laughs] And then they tried: [imitating voice of the newswoman] "Oh, well, this is something new and exciting for somebody like you." I said, "You mean because I have gray hair?" [chuckle] She said, "Oh, have you ever been to a convention before?" [laughs] And I said, "Yes. This is my fourth." "Oh, my goodness!"

And then the next question was, "Well, have you ever held a position?" It was all as if, you know, you little peon, you don't know what's going on around here. I said, "Well, slightly," and then I just gave her a list of the things that I had belonged to and done. She said, "Do you think this was different?" I said, "Yes. It was stacked!"

That was a little station down in Southern California, and they put it on CBS, and they sent it out all over the country. [laughs] Somebody said, "I heard this radio program and this woman was sure mad, and then I heard it was Lucile!" [hearty laugh] Right then I couldn't care what I said.

Chall: So, now, these resolutions that you're talking about, didn't they come up on the floor at something like one or two o'clock in the morning?

Hosmer: Oh, all of them did. Any resolutions.

Chall: Because I went to bed after 16C because it was too late already in the West.

Hosmer: Yes, yes.

Chall: I can imagine what it was like in the East.

Hosmer: Oh, yes! We were up until three and four in the morning every night, and they kept all of these things. . . And then they'd turn the microphones down so we couldn't even hear the wording of the things. And then they had them roaring their approval of all these things, you know, and so they just passed.

Chall: Well, there were some issues, I guess, that were going to come up with respect to the platform on foreign policy.

Hosmer: Well, that was the 16C thing.*

Chall: Well, the 16C was, of course, the big battle in the early part of the day.

Hosmer: Yes. It shouldn't have been brought in.

Chall: What was your feeling about 16C?

Hosmer: Well, it was good. It made a lot of sense. But I think it's just one of those things that they couldn't afford. It would have released the delegates to vote for Reagan.

Chall: That's right.

Hosmer: So that's why they couldn't have it.

Chall: The Ford people couldn't have it?

Hosmer: Yes. That was another one of those things.

Chall: It was a test vote. It wasn't a test when nobody knows what they're voting for, or on, or anything else. Why was it difficult to know what they were voting on?

Hosmer: Because they'd turn the microphones down.

Chall: But hadn't people been apprised of what it was? I mean, was it only the people watching television who knew what was going on? [chuckles]

Hosmer: It's the truth. You know, when we had all these various speakers, they just turned the microphones down. We didn't know. I came home and heard from the people who watched it some of the things that went on that I couldn't even find out what happened. It was as simple as that. It's the worst one of the four I've been to.

Chall: Is that right?

*16C was a proposed change in the convention rules which would have required Mr. Ford to name his potential vice-presidential choice about twelve hours before the nomination roll call. If he refused to do so, all delegates pledged to him would have been freed.

Hosmer: Of course, I have to admit that at the others we didn't have the hassles. We had the hassles from the outside and trouble with the Rockefeller people when Goldwater got the nomination and things like that. But the actual. . .

We knew it was going to be a battle when we went back there, and it was close, only fifty-one votes, with all the manipulation. And then according to the tales we were told from New York and New Jersey and Pennsylvania, there were threats all over the place. You saw the way Mr. Rockefeller behaved with the sign?

Chall: I didn't see it, but I read about it the next day, yes, and there were some rather tense. . .

Hosmer: Well, it just was typical. It was just disgusting that a man of his supposed stature could behave the way that he did, tearing up somebody's sign, and waving the telephone up in the air.

But according to the people who talked to us from those states, there were threats made on their jobs and on their mortgages and on loans.

Chall: Is that right?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. Well, for the East--that's more prevalent back there in the eastern part--

Chall: The party control.

Hosmer: The party control back there. So there's a lot of feeling of bitterness, there's a lot of people who are not going to do anything in this campaign. But, you see, the trouble is that most people who are involved in the political scene feel that Rockefeller controls both of them, both Carter and Ford, so there wouldn't be much choice. [laughter]

Chall: Well [laughs] that's going a little too far.

Hosmer: Well, he belongs to the Bilderbergers, which is Rockefeller-founded; he's one of the founders of it.

Chall: What is the name of that? Bilderbergers?

Hosmer: Well, there's a castle, Bilderberg Castle, where the international financiers have been meeting for years, helping in controlling international economics, and the people who attended the meetings were called the Bilderbergers. [spells the name]

Chall: I see. That's a new one [to me].

Hosmer: Bernhardt is one of them. You know, remember how they really paddled him just recently, Prince Bernhardt of the Netherlands, but they never once mentioned that.

And then David [Rockefeller] comes along just recently and organizes a new group called--what did they call that? Tri-lateral Commission. David Rockefeller was the one behind that one. And Carter was at both of those meetings. So, we just figure. . . [laughs] Oh! [deep sigh]

Chall: Well, now, with respect to 16C, when you say the people didn't know what they were voting on--

Hosmer: No, I mean it was almost--you couldn't hear the resolution as it was worded. And you see, of course, on the 16C the way they had to vote in the East was the unit rule, and the unit rule means what the majority has selected. Then everybody has to go that way.

Chall: The majority of each delegation?

Hosmer: Well, each state delegation.

Chall: Was that required on 16C only?

Hosmer: Oh, on everything.

Chall: On everything?

Hosmer: Everything, yes.

Chall: But many delegations don't work that way. But this was required?

Hosmer: That was required by the delegations where the state laws required it.

Chall: Oh, yes.

Hosmer: And most of the eastern states do.

Chall: Yes. California does, does it not?

Hosmer: Yes. Well, winner take all, yes. It's the same idea. But that's only for the president's, you see. They're pledged, I mean, on that. On other things they weren't supposed to, but it just seemed--

Chall: But it was required in the other states?

Hosmer: It was required in those other states; the unit rule was required in other states on other things. In California the unit rule applied only for the first two votes, the first two ballots, for president.

Chall: So that in 16C and the platform resolutions, the--

Hosmer: The unit rule was imposed.

Chall: It was imposed by the chairman?

Hosmer: By the states.

Chall: By the chairman of the convention?

Hosmer: No, no, no. The unit rule is imposed by the state delegation if that state delegation was elected or selected under those rules within its own state.

Chall: Not just for the presidential balloting. Now are you saying that the unit rule was made to apply to all other things as well?

Hosmer: All things in some of these states, yes.

Chall: By state rule?

Hosmer: By state laws, yes.

Chall: I see. It had nothing to do with the convention.

Hosmer: No, not with the convention, because the national convention has just the opposite. The national convention says that the state has no right to impose a unit rule, but the state laws under which you're elected or selected say: "You go by this or else," and you just don't go back home. [chuckle] I mean, it's almost this strong.

In fact, the Mississippi delegation, you know, that split--they said they were going back home after dark, and some of them said they were going to leave because they had--you know. Matt W. Reed [?] has done this before; this is not the first time he's pulled a stunt like this.

Chall: Yes. I guess the Mississippi delegation changed. That was with 16C, wasn't it, with respect to 16C that the Mississippi delegation--?*

Hosmer: Well, see, they had promised to go one way and then they went the other, through arm twisting. [chuckle]

*The Mississippi delegation held to the unit rule and voted against 16C although they had been expected to vote for it; the delegates then abandoned the unit rule in the presidential nomination, giving sixteen votes to Ford, fourteen to Reagan: San Francisco Chronicle, August 19, 1976.

Chall: Now, when 16C was--when the balloting was finished, did you have the feeling that you'd lost the nomination?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: You didn't consider it that much of a defeat?

Hosmer: No, because of the fact it was introduced so late, number one, and the other thing was because there were a lot of people who told us that they did not like it being brought up so late and they would vote that way, but that did not mean they were not going to continue thier vote for Reagan. So, you see, they did. There was only a difference of fifty-one votes, and there was a lot of difference in the 16C vote.

In my book, I think it was a very foolish move on the part of the campaign chairman.

Chall: The Reagan campaign people?

Hosmer: Yes, the national ones.

Chall: That would be Mr. [John] Sears and Mr. [Paul] Laxalt?

Hosmer: No, not Laxalt. It would have been Mr. Sears.

Of course, one of the papers in the East, the Manchester Leader--which is up in Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire? or somewhere up in there--claimed that the Reagan national committee was infiltrated by the Rockefeller people.

Chall: Well, how about that? Do you think that's true?

Hosmer: Oh, I think it's possible. I know it's possible. During the Gold-water campaign, the offices were bugged and the machines for printing and stuff were sabotaged and printed, because I had two friends working, and he finally had to send for his own printer from out here to go back to Washington to get the printing done properly.

So, I know it happens, and they checked the offices every single morning and every single night because of the bugging. I mean, this is nothing new. It's been going on since Roosevelt's days. [laughs] I think he was the first one that started using the wire tapping, from what I've read and heard. But I do know that things do happen, strange things.

Well, I had a friend who was in the '56 convention, and he had some pretty hairy tales, as my son would say [laughter] about some of the things that went on. And, of course, it was even worse back then.

Hosmer: There wasn't the public acknowledgement that things like this happen, so that made a difference.

Chall: Who in the California delegation had an ear to the Reagan people? Did you feel that although you were totally all committed to Reagan that you really didn't have much say to him?

Hosmer: Oh, no.

Chall: That you were cut off?

Hosmer: No, we weren't cut off.

Chall: You weren't?

Hosmer: No.

Chall: How close--?

Hosmer: The people in the California delegation were all Reagan people, 100 percent Reagan people. They were the workers, and that was why they were so solid, and they didn't do any swerving or anything like that. We had direct contact because our chairman Lyn Nofziger did a very good job. He did, and Mike Curb, and Elsa Sandstrom. We had contact direct, and any one of us could have talked to Reagan any time. In fact--well, you remember--I had a letter from him just before he left.

Chall: Oh?

Hosmer: On the Schweiker thing.

Chall: Oh, I didn't know that.

Hosmer: And it was a personally written note. I could pick up the phone and talk to him if I wanted to, and he would accept my judgment on things. There was a wonderful rapport there, and he used to come in. We had a caucus every morning. He didn't come in every morning, but everything that came up went directly to him and then came right back from him. You know, the business of running as vice-president--he said right from the beginning he would not, because there were certain policies that it would be hard for him to espouse. But basically, as he said, he hadn't worked for a long time, and it was time he got back to work and earned a living too. So, that had something to do with it.

But there was very close communication with the California delegation. We had no problems at all.

- Chall: Was the California delegation divided in any way about 16C? You might have felt it wasn't a wise thing to do, but it wasn't such a problem?
- Hosmer: No. We went along on it, but at least some of us thought it maybe wasn't a wise thing to do it at that short notice. But, you see, even Ford came out for it afterwards. He said for next time, but he didn't want to do it this time, you see.
- Chall: Well, I can see from his point of view why he wouldn't want to.
- Hosmer: No, he wouldn't want to. So, it was as simple as that. But I think there was one person in the delegation who wouldn't go for 16C. It seems to me there was one, yes. But she still voted for Reagan. There were solidly 167 votes.
- Chall: Right. And 167 votes automatically had to go on 16C anyway.
- Hosmer: No. You could make it 166 votes.
- Chall: Oh. It didn't have to be a unit-rule vote?
- Hosmer: It didn't have to be, no. It was only on Reagan that it had to go by unit rule. You see, there is a difference in our state, then, from other states. That's our state election laws that are covering it.
- Chall: What were some of the problems that you took up every day in your caucus that you had to talk about?
- Hosmer: Gee! [chuckles]
- Chall: Can you recall what some of the issues might have been? Did they have to do with the platform?
- Hosmer: Yes, there was discussion of the platform. There was the ERA and the anti-abortion and all that. We had our representatives from the Platform Committee, we had our representatives from the Rules Committee, we had our representatives from the Credentials Committee, and we gave our reports, and if there were any questions then the questions and answers came back and forth.
- Chall: Was the delegation divided on such things as the ERA?
- Hosmer: Oh, no.
- Chall: It was not divided?
- Hosmer: Oh, no. Not on ERA and abortion.

Chall: It was opposed?

Hosmer: You see, Reagan is opposed to abortion and he's opposed to the ERA. Most of our people were. There wasn't any apparent division on that. The only thing that there was any division on was 16C, because some of them felt that it was not wise and others felt that it had come too short a time before and they didn't think it was going to be helpful to Reagan.

Chall: I see. So, that was the only time--

Hosmer: That was the only time--

##

Chall: I understand that the ERA stayed in the platform because the platform committee couldn't get twenty-seven signatures to take it out. [tape off briefly]

Hosmer: Where were we at?

Chall: Well, let's see. What did you do during the day? Were all of you Reagan people busy trying to lobby uncommitted delegates or anything of this kind? Did you have a certain role to play?

Hosmer: No. Certain ones were assigned. Those of us who were members of the executive committee--I mean, in representing the delegation on the other committees, the national committees--we were all located at the Alameda Plaza, which was the Reagan headquarters. The alternates were at hotels farther out. Some of them were half an hour from their hotel, which is rough, but I was there at the Alameda Plaza. If I hadn't been there, I'd have stayed with this friend of mine who lived about ten or twelve minutes from it. I was planning to stay with her if I hadn't gotten into that place.

Chall: Well, it's better, isn't it, to be in the hotel where it's all going on.

Hosmer: Well, that's where the main headquarters were.

[chuckle] One night we invaded the Ford headquarters at the Crown Center Hotel. Hallmark Cards put up that fancy hotel there. Five busloads. We just marched around the lobby. [laughs] I was accused of organizing it, but I didn't really.

Chall: [laughter] Who did, really?

Hosmer: Well, I don't really know who started it, but we all enjoyed it. We went along with it and had a good time. You know, you're so wound up when you get through with one of those things, and you just don't

Hosmer: feel like going home and going to sleep. In fact, we seldom did. We just sat up and talked maybe a couple more hours. But you get to the point towards the end of the thing, you know, that you're just too corked to really do much. You drag yourself out.

I was smart this time, though. I learned this when I was on the parole board. I took these plastic bags and I got a mixture of nuts down at the health food store and I put raisins in them. Then I took it with me, you know, and then I had it that way.

Chall: That's a good idea.

Hosmer: Because from 4:30 on all you could get were those horrible hotdogs and cokes and things that are available. They have beer and, you know, everything in the world that would put weight on you.

So, what I did, though—we got through with our caucuses usually before noontime, and a couple of times my roommate and I--

Chall: Who was your roommate?

Hosmer: Isabella Dunn from Menlo Park. Her aunt was national committeewoman Eleanor Ring. She was our county chairman and she did a fantastic job.

Chall: Was she a delegate?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: There were two female delegates from this congressional district?

Hosmer: No. They're two congressional districts.

Chall: Oh, I see. So, she was from the other congressional district?

Hosmer: She was from the other, yes.

Chall: So, the two of you would go out at noon and do what?

Hosmer: Well, sometimes we went out together, but, you see, I had this friend who lived back there, and she'd pick me up and take me over to her house for lunch. I'd just have salad and then I'd have cold. . . She put a roast been in her rotisserie.

She had a big reception for Phyllis Schlafly and some of her Eagle Forum at her home on Sunday, and it was Phyllis's birthday and my birthday on the same day, so they had a birthday cake for us.

Hosmer: But anyhow, these are the anti-ERA women, most of them, and so we had a nice meeting at her place that day. That was before the convention started.

They had all kinds of things. I went to a church breakfast and I went to an ACU luncheon. That's American Conservative Union. It runs throughout the country.

Chall: Are you a member of the American Conservative Union?

Hosmer: Yes. That's nonpartisan, you know. They had some interesting speakers there that day, at lunch time.

Then, of course, we started out--the bus we had to take left at three o'clock, you see, so we left the hotel by three o'clock, you know, and went out to the grounds. Then, if we were lucky, if we got out before two o'clock, we could find a place to eat. We did come back one night and went to a place.

Chall: Oh, 2:00 a.m., that is?

Hosmer: Yes. A little late in the day. You don't care whether you eat by that time.

Chall: Yes. And the hotels are closed, the dining rooms.

Hosmer: Well, the restaurants; the hotel had kept their dining rooms open until two o'clock, but if we came in after that the only thing that was available was drinks in somebody's room, and if you didn't like to do that. . . Boy, I saw some of that going on! [laughs] I couldn't have "tooken" it!

Chall: My, it would make it very hard to be able to work well the next day if you did much drinking.

Hosmer: I didn't try it.

Chall: But people do.

Hosmer: I know. It's just part and parcel of the whole thing. It's too bad. But I guess you can develop a tolerance for that like you can for arsenic [laughter] if you insist upon it!

Chall: That's right. I'm sure you can, and over the years I think people do.

Hosmer: When decisions have to be made, I need all the brains I've got.

Chall: Well, what kind of decisions did any of you have to make actually on the delegation?

Hosmer: Well, we didn't have to make too many of them.

Chall: Not on yours anyway.

Hosmer: Not on ours. We were fortunate in that way. Of course, we made contacts and we talked to people from other places that we knew to see what the circumstances were. I had one gal come bouncing up to us. She used to live over here in Merced. She was in the Florida delegation. Of course, she was already for Reagan [chuckle], so there wasn't any work to do on the thing.

But there were certain people assigned to talk to people on other delegations. A lot of them did it on their own. The ones that did it on their own, we wished they hadn't sometimes. They just didn't use wisdom, judgment, in some of the cases, because there's no sense in going after somebody who's already set. You know, you just antagonize people.

But we met a lot of the Ford people when we went out to these different little restaurants for lunch and things.

Chall: Oh, I see. You were wearing your hat?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. Not our hats, just our badges. We had the ribbon that went across and the buttons.

Chall: I would assume that in meeting with the Eagle people and the American Conservative Union there would be some discussion about tactics?

Hosmer: It had nothing to do with the convention.

Chall: I see. It was just a get-together because you were all of a similar point of view?

Hosmer: Yes. And there were people there. James Buckley was there, and Senator Jesse Helms, and some of those people, and Stanton Evans. We just wanted to hear what they had to say, and they wanted an opportunity to meet the people who were a part of their group and who took their publications, while they were there. You see, it was a gathering from all over the country.

Chall: That's right. It was a good plan.

Hosmer: So, that was the only purpose of it. They had all kinds of teas and luncheons. But most of them were held at the time when, if you went to them, you'd miss the buses going out. A lot of those things are set up mainly for the wives and the husbands of the delegates, you see; the tours and all that sort of thing.

Chall: Oh, I see. Was Phyllis Schlafly a delegate this year?

Hosmer: No, she wasn't a delegate.

Chall: She has been in the past, hasn't she?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. She's been a delegate to two or three conventions that I've been in, I know that. But she wouldn't allow them to make a fight on the ERA at the convention. She said if the Reagan people didn't win, they'd be the goats, and she was right. I was glad she was smart enough to pull out on that. They were trying to do it. They did get the anti-abortion plank in. That was a compromise. But that was one reason a lot of them wanted to storm the place and force it, but we didn't have the vote, so it's silly to go and fight for something when you know that the vote is not there. And also the ones who are against ERA didn't want to be blamed for Reagan's losing, and that would have been exactly what would have happened.

That was my opinion, as I told her, and we were talking about priorities. I said, "You know, ERA is your priority, but my priority in my delegation is to do what we can to get Reagan elected, and I can't afford to be mixed up in anything which could interfere with that," and she agreed with me.

All these things are done in passing, you know. You're going one way and they're going the other way, and maybe you talk for four or five minutes, or you get together around the table late at night for dinner, or something like that--for breakfast usually. Breakfast was where you met other people and talked. Then, of course, usually you were stopped all the way down the hall to your room because somebody's door was open. We were all Reagan people at that hotel, so there was always a lot of discussion and talk.

Then they had the rallies as they came in; when Nancy [Reagan] came in. They had all of the hoopla that goes on at those things, you know. [chuckles]

Chall: But that's no different from any other convention.

Hosmer: No. They're all the same. They're all the same.

Chall: They're all the same that way. But was it different this time with respect to the role of the wives of the main candidates, like Mrs. Ford and Mrs. Reagan? It seemed to me a great deal of attention on television was paid to these two women as they came and left the hall. Was that more than usual?

Hosmer: No, no. You see, the candidate is not supposed to appear until after the election, so the wives had to do it, or the families, or both. Nancy got a tremendous ovation. Of course, Betty [Ford] had to do

Hosmer: the bump with Tony Orlando. Oh! Oh! Trying to show everybody she was one of the people! [laughs]

Chall: You never saw that, of course, because you were--

Hosmer: No, but I sure heard about it! But I saw her up there. I mean, she came up, you know, before the president: "Here I am!" She's sure she was president! [laughs]

Nancy sure got a tremendous ovation every time she showed.

Chall: How did you all feel after the nomination?

Hosmer: Gypped. [laughter]

Chall: You really felt gypped?

Hosmer: No. That's not really fair. But there's a tremendous letdown. We knew with the unit rule and the control that the Ford people. . . It was never a Republican convention; it was a Ford convention. Nearly all the newspapers even, and they're not too friendly to Reagan in many cases, admitted that it was pretty well completely controlled.

Comparing Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan

Chall: Now, I don't know what you feel about James Kilpatrick. He does represent, I think, a conservative point of view.

Hosmer: A conservative point of view. [chuckles]

Chall: Would you agree that he represents a conservative point of view?

Hosmer: Oh, sure.

Chall: He felt in one of his articles during the convention that the Reagan-ites were [reading from article] ". . . standing on principle; and they'll fall on principle too. They will drown on principle. They will never surrender. . . This is folly. What gets you is that when it comes to issues of true principle, the differences between Ford and Reagan are infinitesimal."* And he's not the only one who wrote this way. William Safire--I'm not sure that he represents--

*James Kilpatrick, "Gang War in Kansas City," The San Francisco Chronicle, August 16, 1976.

Hosmer: He sure doesn't. [laughter]

Chall: [reading from article]: "The conservatives and other Reaganites have no cause for complaint or reason for bitterness. President Ford won the nomination fairly and squarely and earned the right to expect his opponent at this contested convention to gulp a couple of times and then to support his candidacy with enthusiasm."*

Hosmer: I have yet to see something like that happen at a convention! [laughter] It's not human nature. [laughter] Oh, Reagan's a party man. He'll go out and work for Ford. In fact, I got a telegram from him just the other day where he asked "Dear Supporter" to go out and work for the Republican president.

Chall: Yes, he has done that, and there is a unity committee that has been formed with Mike Curb and Evelle Younger as the co-chairmen, and among the women, Margaret Brock, who is a Ford supporter, and Eleanor Ring, who is a Reagan supporter. They are the only two women whose names are on this unity committee.

Hosmer: Yes. This would be statewide.

Chall: Twenty Republican leaders on the unity committee, and apparently unity committees have been set up, I understand, or are supposed to be set up, in every county.

Hosmer: I was invited to a unity party the other night.

Chall: And what about it? Are you going?

Hosmer: Bill was here, you know.**

Chall: Would you have gone if it hadn't been for Bill?

Hosmer: Oh, I might have, because it was held at the home of Bruce Mitchell, who was a class chairman. [?] I can remember in the Goldwater meeting, you know, when Rockefeller lost, Bruce came along and worked.

Chall: As a Rockefeller person, he worked for Goldwater?

* William Safire, "How Ford Can Hit the Ground Running," San Francisco Examiner, August 22, 1976.

**Bill Hosmer had injured his back and was recuperating in bed in Mrs. Hosmer's apartment.

Hosmer: Yes, for Goldwater, after the primary. You know, we've always done that. But there is some very deep bitterness among the Reagan people for some of the maneuvers and the manipulations that went on, and they don't think there's any difference between Carter and Ford, just that [chuckle] they talk a little differently. But I don't know. It's kind of hard to say.

Chall: Do you think that there's a difference between Reagan and Ford, really?

Hosmer: Oh, definitely.

Chall: So, you wouldn't agree with Kilpatrick?

Hosmer: No, I don't agree with him. But then, you see, this is the same criticism that they had in '68, the Rockefeller people, and Ray Bliss said that he didn't want any of those steely-eyed Republican women who won't compromise on principle to have to deal with. They couldn't bend their principles, you know, stuff like that.

I mean, it's nothing new. Anybody who takes a stand on principle is always considered gimlet-eyed or hard or unbending or something like that.

Chall: Well, there was a feeling, I think, that it's one thing--and this comes, of course, after the 1964 election and convention--that it's one thing to win the convention; it's another thing to win the election.

Hosmer: That's right.

Chall: And I think you felt that way with respect to the Schweiker matter.

Hosmer: Well, and I also felt that way as far as Reagan was concerned. I didn't think that Ford was a man who was capable of debating a person who's as slick in his maneuvers and quick answers as Carter is. Ford to me seems so--[makes whistling, wooshing sound], you know, where Reagan would have. . . All of the newspapers said the same thing, that Reagan was the one who had the capacity and the ability to handle things. He's got a quick mind, a steel-trap mind, and the charisma that Ford just ain't got.

I mean, to me it's not a matter of personality; it's just a matter of wasted energy, you know, because unless the things that Carter has been accused of are verified and they can be exposed so that the great majority of people know about it--he's a slicker, because now he talks about things as a hard-working farm boy, and he was born to one of the wealthiest families in Georgia, number one.

Hosmer: I mean, everything in his term as governor was a disaster, apparently. So, I mean, it was a matter of. . . You know, when you work for people, you like to have them be somebody who has the capacity or the ability to handle themselves under any circumstances.

I think [Robert] Dole was, as a selection, right there in Middle America, along with Ford, because he was a friend, you know, and he could work with him. That, to me, was about the weakest reason for it. I didn't approve of that. But, at the same time, Dole is sharp and quick, and he could probably handle Mondale and Carter without any difficulty, and that may have been the reason. Everyone was surprised. They thought it was going to be Baker, but then there was his wife.

Chall: Well, would you have preferred Baker or would you have preferred somebody else, somebody more conservative, in terms of the pick?

Hosmer: Baker was conservative enough; he was a moderate conservative. I wouldn't want to see another conservative on the ticket. That's what they did in '64, you see, Ford is not--don't say he's conservative. [chuckle] He just ain't.

Chall: He's not conservative?

Hosmer: No. Well, let me say he's moderate. I wouldn't call him a moderate conservative; I'd call him a moderate. He changes his mind so on things that you really don't know what he does believe or stand for. That was my greatest concern where he was concerned. That's kind of duplicating things there.

But Baker would have been a good man. I have nothing against Dole, except that geographically I thought it was a poor choice. There should be somebody in the South, not necessarily ultra-ultra or anything like that. Baker, you see, would be kind of in that category.

Chall: He's on the border, yes.

Hosmer: He's on the border there.

Chall: Yes. I don't know what it was actually that changed his mind.

Hosmer: It's supposed to have been his wife, because of her background.

Chall: It might have been.

Hosmer: And yet she's supposed to have been cured.

Chall: She might very well be recovered from drinking, and it wouldn't be fair.

- Hosmer: Yes. It isn't fair because, jeepers, you see all these people, you know, like Dick Van Dyke, back on the TV, and so many others who've gone through it and come out of it.
- Chall: Oh, yes. It's very common.
- Hosmer: And one of the friends that I worked with on the board was somebody who--he, you know, never touches it, never even looks at it. He doesn't make any bones about it.
- Chall: Yes, and more and more people don't. They admit to be alcoholics.
- Hosmer: No, that's why. Well, it isn't such a horrible sin any more, you know, and it's a matter of their chemistry and stuff.
- Chall: Yes. Were you one of the people who yelled, "No!" when, I don't know who it was, felt that maybe the nomination of Ford should be made unanimous?
- Hosmer: I didn't yell; I just didn't do it.
- Chall: I see. But there were people who were--
- Hosmer: Oh, yes. Sure. All over. All over.
- Chall: And in the California delegation too?
- Hosmer: Mainly. And Texas, I'd say.
- Chall: I see. And who were the horn-blowers? There were lots of horns being blown.
- Hosmer: Oh! Oh, I tell you, we could have killed them!
- Chall: I think that was Texas, but I'm not sure.
- Hosmer: Oh, they had some in our delegation. I don't think there were more than three or four that I know, and we would have shot them. There was so much noise there. You just couldn't believe the noise there. Your ears were just ringing when you got through. And there was a couple a couple of rows in back of me, and I could have--oh!
- But I don't know where they were. I think the horns were sold on both sides. Both sides had them.
- Chall: Oh, I see.
- Hosmer: You know, they had these guys who. . .

Chall: It was said that all those horns were the Reagan people who just--

Hosmer: Because it was said doesn't necessarily mean that's what it was. [laughs] Well, it's just like--the people that were in the Reagan stands were the Young Republicans from all over the country, and there were busloads, and they paid their own expenses back there. The Ford people, according to the reports, had all their expenses paid, all the young people there that they had in the galleries. And our young people did it on their own. We're very proud of them. They're a nice bunch of kids, and they worked their heads off to make money to go back there. But, as I say, that's just one of the claims that was made. We do know that some of them were invited back to lunch and dinner, you know, with expenses paid too. [laughs] To the Oval Room!

Chall: I guess it's always disappointing when you lose. Well, this may have been the first time that you definitely lost, in the convention, although I don't know about 1968; I'll talk to you about that.

There were some television shots of mainly women--I mean, who else--in tears after the vote was cast.

Hosmer: Goldwater?

Chall: No. Reagan, this time.

Hosmer: Oh, yes! Plenty of them.

Chall: Did you stay up all that night talking again?

Hosmer: Usually, yes. Most of us, yes.

Chall: You were pretty washed out, I would imagine, at the end of that night.

Hosmer: The next day really, yes. And then we went back the next night for the vice-president.

Chall: What about the morning when Reagan gave his farewell speech?

Hosmer: Oh, boy! That was hard! That was tough on everybody. In fact, the guy next to me said [tearfully], "Lucile, have you got a Kleenex?" [laughs] I nearly died, I was so surprised. But he did.

Chall: Well, that was very moving. I watched it myself on television, and one doesn't have to look at that sad picture again to get the feeling.

- Hosmer: Well, when Reagan came in, you know, he stood there for a minute and he said, "Sorry, I've got a baseball in my throat." [laughs] You know, it was so cute. Of course, he did a good job. Nancy, of course, she could hardly talk; it was really rough on her.
- Chall: Yes, she was really. . .
- Hosmer: Yes. And then he had a closed caucus of our group. "I'm a little wounded, but I'm not slain. I'll rise and fight with you again." Yes.
- Chall: You were part of, then, of both of his farewell speeches--that to his campaign workers and to the California delegation.
- Hosmer: Oh, yes.
- Chall: Well, that must have been a wringing-out morning.
- Hosmer: [laughs softly] It was. It was a wringing-out morning is right. It was really difficult.
- Chall: Yes. I think from what I know from others, whether Democrats or Republicans, that these are all very difficult times when your candidate loses.
- Hosmer: Oh, sure they are. Especially when it's so close! [laughs]
- Chall: Yes, when it's so close, and you're usually so exhausted that almost anything can upset you.
- Hosmer: Oh, yes. Anything knocks you for a loop. Sure. There's no ifs or maybes about it.
- Chall: So, that night, how--?
- Hosmer: Then that night we went back to vote. It was all cut and dried.
- Chall: What did you feel about Ford's speech that was supposed to have been so stirring?
- Hosmer: It was the best speech I've heard him make. It's a matter of comparisons. [laughs] What did you think about Reagan's speech?
- Chall: I was out that night, and when I came back and was driving home, I turned the radio on and listened to Reagan's speech. When I found out that it was totally extemporaneous, which it had been, I could feel that he has quite a gift.

Hosmer: That's what I meant, you see. For a real knock-down drag-out campaign, he had seven ways to send you. [laughs]

Chall: Yes. So were his speeches to his campaign people--they were supposed to be well stated.

Hosmer: Well, he has that ability. I first knew him when he was campaigning for Goldwater, and I used to be amazed at the things, you know, the things that came up and the way he was able to analyze them. Then I watched him over the years when he was up in Sacramento, and I gained a great respect for his ability to do these things. He's direct, and it's just that he has it, you know; I mean, it's just like Nancy has it. She's a lady and she'll always be a lady under any circumstances. She's quick, and she's sharp, and they never caught her saying the wrong thing at the wrong time or the wrong place because she's intelligent enough to be able to judge those things.

Chall: Have you been in meetings and social events with Nancy Reagan?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And how do you find her?

Hosmer: She's real warm.

Chall: She is warm?

Hosmer: Oh, yes. She's very warm. In fact, I had 250 people here and they all felt that way. And over the eight years he was there, up in Sacramento, I've been to many things, and Nancy remembers you. She spotted me in the crowd in a special way. You know, it's those little things that matter, because I never expect it. I remember one time I was going through the line up in Sacramento. I can't even remember what it was for now. I always assume that I'm one of the thousands of people, and I just say, "I'm Lucile Hosmer." Ron just leaned over and said, "I know you, Lucile." [laughter] You know, like that. Of course, that makes you feel good.

But anyhow, I just don't take it for granted, because I know in the speeches I make, I have so many people come rushing up to me and calling me by my first name, and I don't know who they are, really.

Chall: Yes. It's a gift to be able to recall names and faces.

Hosmer: But I have a very good memory for names and faces. But I always manage not to say anything that's going to hurt their feelings, and this is the thing you have to do. But sometimes you can't help it. I had one person--I talked to her on the phone after a meeting,

Hosmer: and I said, "Were you at the meeting today?" There were only 500 at the meeting. [ironically] I said, "Oh, I didn't see you at the meeting." She said, "Well, I saw you." [indignantly] You know, just like that. I said, "Well, I don't see how you could help it. I was conducting it," you know, or something like that. But she was entirely indignant that I hadn't seen her, and sometimes you just don't see everybody.

I had one of my very best friends here that day who had come all the way up from Carmel, and I heard from everybody else she was here, and I said, "She was?" [laughs] You know, when you have that many people coming through your house and all your problems that you have with them.

But she [Nancy Reagan] answers questions, and another thing about her that I like is that if she doesn't know, she says, "I don't know the answer to that, and I wouldn't want to answer it because I don't have the facts." And I respect somebody for that, and I like the way she did that. But she has a nice, warm, friendly manner and a nice smile, and she does remember people very well.

Chall: So, she's a good wife, a good candidate's wife.

Hosmer: Oh, yes, she is.

Chall: In 1960--you all went back to the convention pledged to the favorite son, but there was also some conservative activity going on and there was also Rockefeller. Nixon apparently had the nomination, but he and Rockefeller had what was known as the "Truce of Fifth Avenue" when they worked out the wording of the platform.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: A meeting, I guess in Rockefeller's apartment, with respect to the platform and other issues, sort of at the last minute. This upset the conservatives.

Hosmer: Yes, I remember that. I don't remember what it was about now.

Chall: Well, yes. Those things have a way of not staying important.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Sometimes they're only important like 16C was, as of the moment.

Hosmer: Yes. Quite frequently that's all they are. It's just something relating to that particular period of time.

Chall: Sometimes it has to do, I think, with whether you can make a point with respect to the contending factions.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: However, it did bother the conservatives, and Goldwater was there and was going to be nominated for president, I guess, to represent a conservative group. He asked for the withdrawal of his nomination and made a statement to the conservatives.

Hosmer: Yes, I remember that.

Chall: [quoting from Goldwater's statement]: "If we want to take this party back, and I think we can some day, let's get to work."

Then Nixon was nominated, and he chose Henry Cabot Lodge as his vice-president, which also upset conservatives.

Now, when you went to the convention, were you aware of the rumblings of the conservatives in the background?

Hosmer: Oh, sure. Certainly.

Chall: Were you committed more to them than you were to Nixon?

Hosmer: No. I was committed as a Nixon delegate.

Chall: You were committed legally as a Nixon delegate.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Where were your feelings?

Hosmer: Well, I wasn't excited about Henry Cabot Lodge.

Chall: And were you ever excited about Nixon?

Hosmer: Yes. Yes, I was. I thought he had done a good job. I thought he was a courageous person, and he was up against an awful lot of odds, and I know that his title as "Tricky Dick" first appeared in the Communist Daily Worker. That was the first one that ever pointed at him that way, and then the libs took it up, the liberal papers, and they repeated it as if it was something that came from other sources. But I happen to remember that part, and I always thought that he was very badly maligned and abused over the years. This all went back to Alger Hiss and the Pumpkin Papers and what he did to bring that out. They all said at that time that they were going to get him. They said sooner or later they'd get him. So, as I said, my sympathies were with Nixon.

I think it was interesting that Pat Nixon was rated as the finest first lady we ever had.

Chall: Oh. Where was she so rated?

Hosmer: It was just recently in some of the newspapers, in one of these Gallup reports. Just recently, because of her courageousness and her being always a lady and her support of her husband and so on and so forth.

Chall: Yes, she was that.

Hosmer: And she was a lady all the way through everything, and I don't know how she put up with that last bit. Boy! That was really something.

Joining the Unity Group?

Chall: It must not have been easy.

Well, in 1960, then, you came back and there was no problem then about just working for Nixon?

Hosmer: Oh, no.

Chall: Whereas in this convention you're coming back and I still find that you're not part of the unity group.

Hosmer: Nobody's asked me!

Chall: I mean, you're not a terribly enthusiastic supporter. [laughs]

Hosmer: I'm not. [laughs]

Chall: Where are you putting your time? I understand from what I read that many disappointed Reagan people will be working very hard for [Samuel] Hayakawa. Is that what you intend to do?

Hosmer: I'm not going to work hard for anybody.

Chall: You're not? Where are you going to work not hard?

Hosmer: [laughs] Well, what's the expression? I've shot my wad?

Chall: [laughter] You're not enthusiastic.

Hosmer: I have other things that I--I've got to take care of Lucile first, you see. We've got to remember I retired in March, and I've got other problems that I'm faced with, and I took this thing on during the primary because I believed in Reagan, in what he'd stand for, and

Hosmer: what he could do. But I took an awful lot of time and it took an awful lot of money, and I can't keep up at that speed.

So, I know I'm going to devote my time to things that are going to benefit Lucile for a while.

Chall: Is that your speaking tour?

Hosmer: My speaking, yes. I mean, you know, nobody else is going to do it if I don't. [laughs]

Chall: This will be one election then, in many, in which you haven't worked very hard.

Hosmer: No. Well, you know. If things come up, we'll see. I'm not closing the door on it entirely, but right now there's some traveling I want to do. There are a lot of things I want to do.

Chall: Oh, that's right. You are going off traveling.

Hosmer: I always have been more interested in issues than I have in people, as you know, and candidates. If the candidates stand on the issues that I believe in, then it makes a difference in my attitude.

Party Leaders and the California Presidential Election Campaign

Chall: In the 1960 campaign, which Nixon lost to Kennedy, he [Nixon] still won in California. He won, I think I read, two to one in San Mateo County.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: Where you have a great deal of influence.

Hosmer: So did Reagan [win in San Mateo County.] He won three to one. I mean, that's unusual because usually Rockefeller won and Christopher won.

Chall: Oh, they did.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: But Reagan won here?

Hosmer: Yes, he won here. Quite remarkable. San Francisco too, which was amazing. [laughs]

Chall: Yes, I realize that. That is.

Hosmer: Yes. Excuse me. That was just an aside.

Chall: Yes. Well, I'm glad you put that in, because I'm trying to capsulize so many things.

In 1960 I noticed that it was the first time that you were not designated women's chairman for a campaign. You worked with the Northern California Committee for Richard Nixon for President. That put you on a slightly different level.

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: And Caspar Weinberger was the head of that committee. Can you give me any impressions of working with Caspar Weinberger? I wondered how closely you worked with him.

Hosmer: Cap was one of the most brilliant and talented men that I know. He was a very able person, and he still is. I wouldn't be surprised to see him run for governor.

Chall: Oh, is that right?

Hosmer: Now, that's just one man's opinion. He's back here in California, and I think that he'd have quite a strong following. There are those who think he's too liberal.

Chall: Well, he was--

Hosmer: --always considered to be quite liberal. But he's one of the most brilliant men I've ever known, sharp as a tack.

Chall: I see. So, in that campaign you got along.

Hosmer: I've always gotten along with him. There was only one--we got on the wrong side of the fence on something. I can't remember what it was.

Chall: I think he was a Rockefeller supporter in '64.

Hosmer: That's it. Yes, that was it. I knew what it was. But, I mean, I worked for him when he ran for attorney general, and I think he would have made a darn good one.

Chall: I've gone over the old Rockefeller and Goldwater ballots and lists of delegates and others that I can somehow get hold of, and I notice that some people are always on one delegation or the other. That is, you don't usually find them making switches, but some people do. That, I guess, is a matter of what? Not necessarily expediency, or is it?

Hosmer: Not always. I think in some cases it's a matter of personalities. I operate a little differently, as I stated before. I try to find the candidate who comes closer to matching the principles of government in which I believe, you see, and that's how I base my decisions, as far as congressman, or assemblyman, or senator, of whatever it is.

I can't get excited about Hayakawa. I think he's sharp, I think he's brilliant, and all the rest of it. But I remember when. [chuckle]

Chall: When he was a Democrat?

Hosmer: Well, not just that.

Chall: You remember other issues.

Hosmer: Yes, issues. Certain issues, to which I was diametrically opposed, and most people have forgotten them.

Chall: And what might they be?

Hosmer: Well, I mean, to do with his semantics and some of the education that he introduced, progressive education.

Chall: That does go back a long way, yes.

Hosmer: You see, my mother and my father were teachers, and Merritt was on the school board, and so, I mean, all this sort of thing. That was a field with which I had a great deal of acquaintanceship. There's no doubt of brilliance, you know, but sometimes brilliance without a governor is kind of bad. [laughs]

Chall: Who was it that Ford appointed to be--I don't know that she was accepted yet by the Senate, but he nominated one prominent woman.

Hosmer: I thought that was Nita Ashcraft.

Chall: Oh, Nita Ashcraft, yes.

Hosmer: She's been approved by the Senate for assistant secretary of the air force.

Chall: That's right. Now, she was a Ford--

Hosmer: Yes, she and Paul Haerle.

Chall: That's right. And they at one time, I think, were on the Reagan side.

Hosmer: They were always. She worked for Reagan in the last two campaigns. So did Paul. I've known them both for many years.

Chall: So, these people like Nita Ashcraft and Paul Haerle, this is--

Hosmer: Well, they're both extremely ambitious, and they both wanted to be on the national scene, and Paul didn't care how he got it. In fact, he'd still have been a lawyer in San Rafael if he hadn't got an appointment from Reagan. But he thought, "There's a better chance for Paul with Ford." That's how Ford got a lot of his people.

Nita was the same thing. Now, her husband is still in San Francisco. But she was deputy appointments secretary under Ned Hutchinson, and she got a very nice job for herself for ten years and eight years for her husband. [chuckle]

Chall: She has a job for eight years only if Ford is reelected.

Hosmer: Yes. No, I meant on the state level.

Chall: Oh, on the state level.

Hosmer: She was head of the personnel board.

Chall: Oh, yes.

Hosmer: And her husband was on, I think, workmen's compensation.

Chall: Oh, so both of them had appointments from Reagan.

Hosmer: Yes. So, I didn't think it was exactly what you'd call. . . . That's why there was so much bitterness about Paul Haerle, you see, and her too.

Chall: I see. The bitterness, I guess, stems from the fact that Haerle also was the state chairman, and generally state chairmen are supposed to--

Hosmer: They're supposed to remain neutral until after the primary, yes.

Chall: Well, it will remain to be seen what happens with the central committee positions in January.

Hosmer: That all depends upon who gets elected, by the senators and the state assemblymen, you see.

Chall: Oh, yes, that's right.

Hosmer: And if they're Ford supporters, Haerle will probably stay in, and if they're Reagan supporters or people who don't like him, and an awful lot of people don't like Paul--so, he'll hang on. He'll never give up. Oh, he can be so nasty. Oh!

Chall: Well, as state chairman he's likely to be going out anyway, isn't he?

Hosmer: Yes.

Chall: But there would be others.

Hosmer: Well, the fellow who's vice-chairman would be from the south this time, Mike Montgomery, and he's a good fellow.

Chall: Is that who it is? [checks list] Yes, Michael Montgomery, right.

Hosmer: He's from Southern California. See, then Northern California would have the vice-chairman. But it's too bad. I've known Paul since he was a Young Republican.

Chall: Well, I think that we're just about out of tape, so what we'll do next time is to go back and pick up some of these threads.

Hosmer: Okay.

Transcribers: Michelle Guilbeault and Marilyn White
Final Typist: Marie Herold

TAPE GUIDE -- Lucile Hosmer

Interview 1: September 10, 1975	1
tape 1, side A	1
tape 1, side B	18
Interview 2: December 10, 1975	36
tape 2, side A	36
tape 2, side B	55
Interview 3: August 6, 1976	75
tape 3, side A	75
tape 3, side B	93
Interview 5: December 5, 1976	111
tape 5, side A	111
tape 5, side B [not recorded]	
Interview 4: September 14, 1976	125
tape 4, side A	125
tape 4, side B	146

APPENDICES

OF

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

The California Federation of Republican Women was organized in January, 1925. The first Club had been founded in Los Angeles in 1920 by Mrs. Florence Collins Porter as a Study Club the year the 19th Amendment was passed granting suffrage to women. In California, women had been given the right to vote in 1911.

The objective of the Federation, established in the bylaws, was "to promote a wider knowledge of the principles and policies of the Republican Party." Its goal, also, was to cooperate with the County and State Central Committees to help elect Republican Candidates to office. This early record was compiled by the late Mrs. Edith Van de Water, the Federation's first Historian. Mrs. Van de Water was also one of the Founders, for ten years State President (1932-1942) and for twelve years California National Committeewoman.

Mrs. O. P. Clark was the first President, 1925-1931; she also served as first National Committeewoman from California, elected in 1924.

By 1928, California Republican Women were organized in many of the cities and even in rural areas. A Hoover-Curtis delegation was sent to the National Convention and through the months following they devoted their efforts to the campaign and helped give the Hoover-Curtis ticket the vote it won in California. Mrs. Max B. Arnold, residing in Madera, California and still an active member of the Federation, was a member of the Hoover-Curtis Delegation.

In 1938, at the Convention in Fresno, the delegates voted to join the newly formed National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs (NFWRC) under the name of the California Council of Republican Women. These were the official names until, in 1953, NFWRC changed its name to the National Federation of Republican Women; and, in 1954, California changed to the California Federation of Republican Women. It was composed of three Divisions: Northern with 87 Clubs, Central with 24 Clubs, and Southern with 24 Clubs.

Throughout the years the Federation continued to grow in membership and activities. The members worked on campaigns and taught English and Americanism to the foreign born. Political Seminars were held continually throughout the State. In 1972 when the eighteen-year olds became eligible to vote, CFRW voted to sponsor the California Student Republican Organization through member clubs. That year, also, a "Talent Bank" was established for the purpose of encouraging our many Federated women of outstanding ability to seek elective office or appointment to State Commissions and Boards.

In 1974, a Community Involvement Chairman was appointed to assist volunteers on the local level. Also a new Chairman, Legislative Advocate, kept the Federation in direct communication with the State Legislature in Sacramento. In 1975, the Talent Bank Chairman was renamed the Status of Women Chairman to study current issues affecting women.

The dedicated women, from Mrs. Florence Collins Porter, the "Mother of the Federation," Mrs. O. P. Clark and Ida Koverman, the first Officers in 1925, to the present Officers, have our gratitude for their wise counsel and enlightened leadership.

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

PAST PRESIDENTS

Mrs. Lawrence A. Solberg 1974-1975	Madera, 93637
Mrs. Harry Umhey 1972-1973	Los Angeles, 90027
Mrs. Warren Sandstrom 1970-1971	Stonyford, 95979
Mrs. Louis Lombardi 1968-1969	Glendale, 91201
Mrs. Donald Krotz 1966-1967	Orinda, 94563
Mrs. Logan H. Goodknight 1964-1965	Long Beach, 90803
Mrs. Lucille Hosmer 1961-1963	San Carlos, 94070
Mrs. R. G. Kenyon 1957-1960	Deceased
Mrs. Gladys Leggett Penland 1955-1956	Deceased
Mrs. Gladys O'Donnell 1954-12/1954	Deceased
Mrs. Jâen Wood Fuller 1951-9/1954	Santa Rosa, 95404
Mrs. Paul G. Jasper 1949-1950	Santa Clara, 95050
Mrs. Barbara Whittaker 1945-1948	Deceased
Mrs. Jessie Williamson 1943-1944	
Mrs. Edith Van de Water 1932-1942	Deceased
Mrs. O.P. Clark 1925-1931	Deceased

*Addresses deleted.

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMENNORTHERN DIVISION1976PAST PRESIDENTS1972-73

Aura Edwards (Mrs. F. R.)

Lafayette, Ca. 94549

1968-71

Esther Cooley Page (Mrs.)

Berkeley, Ca. 94708

1964-67

Henriette Steinegger (Miss)

Kentfield, Ca. 94904

1961-63

Virla Krotz (Mrs. Donald)

Orinda, Ca. 94563

1957-60

Lucille Hosmer (Mrs. Merrit)

San Carlos, Ca. 94070

1955-56

Ardis Myhrs (Miss)

Berkeley, Ca. 94709

1953-54

*Gladys Penland (Mrs.)

1949-52

Ruth Kessler (Mrs.)

1947-48

Mary Jasper (Mrs. Paul)

Santa Clara, Ca. 95050

Dates of terms unknownMrs. Parker Maddux
Mrs. Grace Faulkner

Mrs. Pearl Baker

Mrs. Helen Robertson

*Deceased

**Addresses deleted.

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMENSOUTHERN DIVISION1976PAST PRESIDENTS

	<u>1974-75</u>
Mrs. Wayne Scott (Margaret)	
	<u>1972-73</u>
Mrs. John D. Bowler, Jr. (Ann)	
	<u>1970-71</u>
Mrs. Eitel Carpenter (Mary Lou)	
	<u>1968-69</u>
Mrs. Harry Umhey (Oma)	
	<u>1966-67</u>
Mrs. George Thackeray (Grace)	
	<u>1964-65</u>
Mrs. Douglas Yarbrough (Jane)	
	<u>1960-63</u>
Mrs. Logan Goodknight (Dorothy)	
	<u>1957-59</u>
Mrs. Don Petty (Iola)	
	<u>1955-56</u>
Mrs. R. G. Kenyon (Cecil)	
	<u>1951-54</u>
Mrs. Rachel Wylie	
	<u>1947-50</u>
Mrs. L. P. Fuller (Jean)	
	<u>1945-46</u>
Mrs. John C. Kyle	
	<u>1943-44</u>
Mrs. Anna Baker	
	<u>1939-42</u>
Mrs. W. E. Evans	
	<u>1929-38</u>
Mrs. Charles F. Van De Water	
	<u>1925-28</u>
Mrs. Florence Collins Porter	

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMENCENTRAL DIVISION1976PAST PRESIDENTS

Mrs. Roy Sharp	1974-75	Tulare
Mrs. William Brock (Virginia)	1972-73	Bakersfield
Mrs. Richard Zug (Magdlean)	7/70 - d	Merced
Mrs. Herbert Hodgdon (Carol)	1/70 - 7/70	Woodside
Mrs. Lawrence Solberg (Marie)	1968-69	Madera
Mrs. C. W. Peterson (Harriett)	1964-67	Tracy
Mrs. John Donahy (Helen)	1961-63	Fresno
Mrs. Eleanor Erickson Neitzgert	1957-60	Montana
Mrs. Frank Lamberson (Zoe)*	1955-56	Visalia
Mrs. Frank Stierlen (Alys)*	1953-54	Turlock
Mrs. Earl Cecil	1951-52	Fresno
Mrs. Florence Doe	1949-50	Visalia
Mrs. Mrx B. Arnold	1944-48	Madera
Mrs. Clinton Collins*	1939-43	Fresno

*Deceased

HERE IS OUR POWER

- 45 per cent of the vote is cast by women.
- 80 per cent of the 65 million life insurance policies in the United States is in favor of women.
- 65 per cent of the savings is in the names of women.
- 44 per cent of the Public Utilities stocks in the United States is held by women.
- 40 per cent of the real estate, both homes and farms, is held by women.
- There is work for every patriotic woman to do. PRO AMERICA is your opportunity for service.

From the

Constitution of

California Chapter of Pro America

National Organization of Republican Women, Inc.
601 CHANCERY BLDG.
SAN FRANCISCO
EXbrook 7127

LIBRARY

Founded by
Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Sr
and a group of Seattle Women
February 22, 1933
Incorporated August 13, 1934

OBJECT

... The object of this organization shall be to support the Republican Party; to further good government, both local and national; to secure and disseminate truthful information regarding all matters pertaining to our local, state and national political life to secure and disseminate information regarding the character, ability and fitness of candidates, executive, legislative and judicial, and to aid in the nomination and election of honest and efficient men and women. It is our earnest purpose to secure the adoption of right policies and the nomination of proper candidates.

PREAMBLE

... We do, therefore, band ourselves together as an independent organization to support the policies of the Republican Party and the candidates who adhere to these policies; to unite in upholding the Constitution of the United States, with its American traditions and ideals, and to combat all destructive influences which will imperil the sacred heritage of Liberty bequeathed to us by our forefathers.

VOTE FOR LIBERTY

WHILE YOU STILL HAVE

THE LIBERTY

TO VOTE.



VOTE REPUBLICAN

PRO AMERICA

EXbrook 1170



HORSE AND BUGGY CREED

"To gather together informally friends and neighbors to discuss present day conditions and to urge the return to the homely virtues of thrift, morality and constitutionality of 'The Horse and Buggy Days'."

Horse and Buggy Club
sponsored by

California Chapter of
Pro America

EXbrook 3726 601 Chancery Building
San Francisco

WHAT TO DO

Give a "Horse and Buggy" breakfast, tea, supper, picnic or barbecue. Invite a group of friends and neighbors, from 2 to 200 guests. Have Republicans, Jeffersonian Democrats, convertible New Dealers and undecided fence-straddlers. Serve them ham and eggs—if you can afford the ham—and an informative discussion of present political problems. Ask two or three of your guests to come prepared to give facts on campaign issues. Open conversation about taxes, about waste in government expenditures, inflation, farm problems, political machinery or the Constitution. Utilize the best campaign method known—telling facts by word of mouth.

Pro America can supply literature and facts.

Give each guest a "Horse and Buggy" pin and see that each guest in turn pledges to give a "Horse and Buggy" breakfast so that the circles of campaign knowledge will reach out into ever widening spheres of influence among voters.

Convince ten voters to vote Republican.

Kindly notify Pro America headquarters, 601 Chancery Building, San Francisco, telephone EXbrook 7127, of the date of your breakfast, and who and how many attend.

"Horse and Buggy" pins and information may be obtained at headquarters.

Climb on the Buggy and take the New Deal for a ride.

SUGGESTIONS FOR

"HORSE AND BUGGY" BREAKFASTS

SPONSORED BY
PRO AMERICA

When the United States Supreme Court's decision invalidated the NRA, Franklin Delano Roosevelt made his classic remark that the decision put us back in the "Horse and Buggy" days.

Loyal Americans who believe in the preservation of liberty believe also in maintaining the virtues of thrift, morality, and constitutionality which marked the "Horse and Buggy" days.

"Horse and Buggy" to Republicans has become a phrase symbolizing allegiance to American traditions and ideals. Such ideals fired our forefathers to build a great nation. This nation must be maintained on the same strong foundations.

Think about your liberty, your government and your vote! Talk about it! Do something about it!

2-20-43
2.10
6?

What Individual Pro America Members Can Do

1. Volunteer for active work with any of the following committees:

Membership	Educational
Telephone	Legislative
Publicity	Program
Registration of Voters	Organization

2. Secure membership books from headquarters and add as many paid members as possible to the organization.
3. Organize small groups of your friends to meet weekly or monthly for discussion of political issues. Get literature and study courses from Pro America headquarters.
4. Before election day, November 3rd, give Horse and Buggy affairs and have each guest present give a Horse and Buggy affair. Instructions and Horse and Buggy pins may be obtained from headquarters.
5. Go to all Pro America meetings and take prospective members.
6. Give every committee chairman help. Supply names of good speakers for large or small group meetings and for radio.
7. See that you and all your relatives and friends are registered voters who really vote.
8. Arm yourself with Republican facts and talk to everyone with whom you trade and everyone you meet. Carry the message of Pro America. Individual effort is what really counts and anything can be accomplished with public opinion.

PRO AMERICA
California Chapter
National Organization of Republican Women, Inc.
601 Chancery Bldg., San Francisco Exbrook 7127

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
LIBRARY
117 LIBRARY BUILDING



IN GOD WE TRUST

July 30, 1976

Mrs. Evetts Haley
5424 16th Street
Lubbock, Texas 79416

Dear Rosalyn,

You asked me to write to you and tell you what I think about Ronald Reagan's choice of Senator Richard S. Schweiker as his Vice-presidential running mate in the coming election.

You must permit me to preface my letter with this statement.

As a member of the California Delegation and as an active participant in Californian politics from the local level to the national level, (8 years on the National Federation of Republican Women's Board; 4 years on the national board of the National Association of Pro America; member of three previous California delegations; speaker in 37 states), over the years I am happy to tell you why I do believe Ronald Reagan is the only winning candidate the Republican Party has today.

Despite Ronald Reagan's selection of Senator Schweiker of Pennsylvania, and despite the usual distortion of facts by the news media, let us look at the record.

1. Senator Schweiker considers himself an independent.
2. A close scrutiny of his record could easily label him as a "maverick."
3. In Pennsylvania, the electorate regard Senator Schweiker with highest respect.

Now, let us turn to the areas where Ronald Reagan and Senator Schweiker have a compatible philosophy.

1. Senator Schweiker is opposed to "Detente."
2. He is in favor of returning prayer to the schools.
3. He is for a strong national defense, but is opposed to waste in the process.
4. He is against the Washington Establishment.



IN GOD WE TRUST

5. He is against busing.
6. He is against abortion on demand.
7. He is against gun control.
8. His religious convictions make him an independent thinker.
9. He is a strong family man.
10. He believes in the preservation of the family unit.

These are some of the most important issues in the lives of Americans today. Regardless of the labels imposed by the press, these are American principles.

Ronald Reagan knows, as any thinking Republican will acknowledge, that conservatives, alone, will not win him this election.

When Ronald Reagan was Governor in his first term in California, he had Robert Finch, a liberal, elected as his Lt. Governor. This did not change Reagan's stance. It did not change Reagan's philosophy. It did not change Reagan's goals or purposes. Now, let's look at the record today.

Fewer than 20% of Americans formally list themselves as Republicans. A small percent of the 20% consider themselves Conservatives. Without the support of some moderates, some liberals and some independents, Ronald Reagan would have the support of only a minority of a minority. We have been through all this before.

Ronald Reagan knows that a presidential nomination is worth having only if his party is behind him, and that he has a reasonable chance of winning the election. Ronald Reagan is a team player - a party man. He has worked for the election of Republicans throughout the country. He is trying to balance this ticket both geographically and philosophically.

We must believe that moderates and liberals do believe in the basic tenets of the Republican party and they do want what they believe is best for their families and their country.



IN GOD WE TRUST

As president, Ronald Reagan will represent a whole party, a unified party, not just one segment of it. This is his responsibility as President of the United States. His choice, both geographically and ideologically, is, therefore, sound.

Let's be inclusive - not exclusive - and give ourselves the opportunity to win.

Cordially,

Lucile Hosmer

RONALD REAGAN
PACIFIC PALISADES

Dear Lucile

Forgive this hasty, hand written note but I'm off to Miss. to present my prepared running mate to the delegation. Before leaving I wanted to get this word off to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your faith & support.

Your letter to Rosslyn Haley is a masterpiece & tells the story we all need to hear. I assure you my motive was not Ang. I've learned campaigning in the East that the North Eastern states are virtually writing themselves off as already won by Carter. I can not go along with that and will do everything possible to bring the N.E. back into the family.

Again Thanks & Bless you -

Sincerely

Ron



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1963

No. 104

Religious Freedom in America and the Supreme Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most disturbing decisions of the Supreme Court have been those pertaining to prayer and Bible reading in the public schools.

Mrs. Lucile Hosmer, Americanism chairman of the National Federation of Republican Women, recently prepared a report entitled, "Religious Freedom in America and the Supreme Court Decisions," which I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the Record.

Mrs. Hosmer's report follows:

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN AMERICA AND THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

(By Lucile Hosmer)

Our roots are in the past. We live in the present. What we do, today will determine the future.

Background and documentation relating to the first amendment and the historical foundation upon which this Republic of ours was established will be presented in this report. In the process, also, the intent of the writers of the Constitution will be discussed on the basis of documented material. Please remember that the information related is not personal opinion but facts accumulated as the result of considerable research not only in the early histories but also in contemporary writings on the subject.

Obviously, the decision of the Supreme Court Justices indicate that either these men are woefully ignorant of the fundamental principles upon which this Nation was established or else they are willfully ignoring them because they are devotees of the philosophy of "sociological jurisprudence." This concept of law completely disregards the intent, the motive or the purpose of the writers of the Constitution.

"Sociological jurisprudence" is the attitude that law is the means by which society solves all of its conflicts. This attitude is predicated on the belief that the Constitution is out-dated and out-moded because it was written in a different period than our present one. This belief refuses to acknowledge the fact that in our present period, man is the same as when the Constitution was written: man is motivated in the same way; and man's relationships with other men are the same as when the Constitution was written. These facts, to many students of history and government do not justify the approach in this concept of law as advocated by "sociological jurisprudence" since man, himself has not changed.

Let us look at the facts concerning the Constitution's being as applicable today as when it was written because or since man, (himself as man has not changed.) The Constitution enunciates certain fundamental principles which were designed to protect the "sanctity of the individual": to protect him from the "tyranny of government": to defend or to "secure" (keep from being lost) man's "unalienable rights, given to him by his Creator," to life, to liberty and to property." These protections were to be for all posterity and they are just as valid and just as important, today as they were when the Constitution was written.

The preamble to our Constitution states "We, the people, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." They were not contracting nor stipulating with each other as is sometimes claimed by modern sociologists. They were establishing and ordaining (instituting or setting) a Constitution—a permanent form of government where the powers once given are irrevocable and cannot be resumed or withdrawn at pleasure—a Constitution, though originating in consent, becomes when ratified, obligatory as "fundamental ordinance or law."

(Joseph Story "Commentaries on the Constitution": A constitutional classic, equalled only by the "Federalist.") Story, also says, "Our law is justly deemed certain and founded on permanent principles and not dependent upon the caprice or will of particular judges: a more alarming doctrine could not be promulgated by any American court than that it was at liberty to disregard all former rules and decisions and decide for itself without reference to the settled course of antecedent principles." During the last 187 years since the signing of our Declaration of Independence, "all former rules and decisions, all antecedent principles of the courts have maintained that we are a religious people, whose institutions presuppose the existence of a Supreme Being" (U.S. Supreme Court Decision, 1892).

In October 1789, George Washington had this to say: "The liberty by the people of these States of worshiping Almighty God agreeable to their consciences is not only among their choicest blessings, but also their right. While men perform their social duties faithfully, they do all that society or the State can with propriety demand or expect and remain responsible to their Maker, for the religion or modes of faith which they may prefer to profess."

"The relationship of church and state in the United States secures full liberty of religious thought, speech, and action within the limits of the public peace and order. It makes persecution impossible. Religion and liberty are inseparable," Philip Schaff, a distinguished historian, author of "Church and State in the United States," 1888.

He continues: "True liberty is a positive force regulated by law; false liberty is a negative force, a release from restraint. True liberty is the moral power of self-

government; the liberty of infidels and anarchists carnal licentiousness. The American separation of church and state rests upon respect for the church: the infidel's (today's atheist) separation, on indifference and hatred of religion and the church, itself. . . . The American system grants freedom also to irreligious and infidelity but only within the limits of the order and safety of society. The destruction of religion would be the destruction of morality and the ruin of the State. Religious liberty is not an empty sound but an orderly exercise of religious duties and enjoyments of all its privileges. It is freedom in religion not from religion; as true civil liberty is freedom in law not freedom from law."

He further states: "Republican institutions in the hands of a virtuous and God-fearing nation are the very best in the world, but in the hands of a corrupt and irreligious people, they are the very worst, and the most effective weapons of destruction. An indignant people may rise in rebellion against a cruel tyrant; but who will rise against the tyranny of the people in possession of the ballot box and the whole machinery of government? Here lies our great danger and it is increasing every year. Destroy our churches, close our Sunday schools, abolish the Lord's Day and our Republic would become an empty shell and our people would tend to heathenism and barbarianism" (Washington, p. 212).

George Washington in his "Farewell Address," says the following concerning religion: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason, and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Let me quote from an address by Dean Erwin M. Griswold of the Harvard School of Law, in his address at the University of Utah, in February of 1963. In discussing the "interpretation and application of the first amendment," relating to the New York Prayer Case. He says: "First as to long tradition. Is it not a clear matter of historical fact that this was a Christian nation? Of the immigrants who came to previously British North America, by the time of the adoption of the Constitution, virtually all were Christians, in all degrees and types of persuasion which come within that term. Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchinson, Cotton Mather, Jonathon Edwards, William Penn and many others no part of our history? It is true that we were a rather remarkable Christian nation, having for various historical and philosophical reasons, developed a tolerance in matters of religion which was at once virtually unique and a tribute to the men of the 17th and 18th centuries who developed the type of thought which came to prevail here. But this was not a purely humanistic type of thought, nor did it deny the importance and significance

of religion. It is perfectly true and highly salutary that the first amendment forbade Congress to pass any law 'respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' These are great provisions of great sweep and basic importance. But to say that they require that all trace of religion be kept out of any public activity is sheer invention. Our history is full of these traces: Chaplains in Congress and in the Armed Forces; chapels in prisons; 'In God we trust' on our money; to mention only a few. God is referred to in our national anthem and in 'America' and in many others which may be called our national songs. What about Sunday? What about Christmas? Must we deny our whole heritage, our culture, the things of the spirit and soul which have sustained us in the past and helped bind us together in times of good and bad? Does our deepseated tolerance of all religion—or to the same extent of no religion—require that we give up all religious observance in public activities? Why should it? It certainly never occurred to the Founders that it would."

Let us review what some of the Founders, the architects of the Constitution had to say. In April 1789, George Washington said, "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent application to that Almighty Being who rules the universe, who preside in the councils of nations and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to His charge. In tendering this homage to the Great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own, nor those of my fellow citizens at large than either. No people can be found to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs more than those of the United States."

On March 4, 1797, President John Adams said: "And may that Being who is supreme over all, Patron of Order, the Fountain of Justice, and the Protector in all ages of the world of virtuous liberty, continue his blessings upon this Nation and Government and give it all possible success and duration consistent with the ends of His providence."

On March 4, 1805, President Thomas Jefferson said: "I shall need too, the favor of the Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessities and comforts of life, who has covered our infancy with His providence and our riper years with His wisdom and power and to whose goodness I ask you to join in supplication with me that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils and prosper their measures, that whatsoever they shall do shall result in your good and shall secure to you the peace, friendship and approbation of all nations."

Statements of all the other Presidents follow the same line of thought. Historically, it can be proven by the early documents of the Founding Father generation that from the time of the signing of the Mayflower Compact in 1620 (when for the first time in history, men wrote their own laws and agreed to live in obedience to them) "under the guidance of Almighty God" and "by the Grace of God." All during the trials of the Pilgrims in the founding of the Plymouth Plantation (as recorded in Bradford's History); then down to the writing of the first

American Constitution in 1838 known as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut (Old South Leaflet No. 8) every move, every meeting; every decision was based on the hope that "It has pleased Almighty God by the wise disposition of His Divine Prudence . . . for the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God." (Old South Leaflet No. 8.)

Also the First Continental Congress appropriated funds to purchase 20,000 Bibles as the "political textbook for America" to be distributed throughout the 13 States (vol. 8, "Journals of the Continental Congress").

This Nation was Bible based and Bible integrated. The architects of our Constitution were Christians. However they embodied in our Bill of Rights the Christian principle which gave to each individual the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Their intent was not to deprive anyone of his right to worship God, in his own way.

Dean Griswold confirms this in his same address presented to the University of Utah in February of 1963. I quote: "This is a country of religious toleration; this I venture to say again has been and is a Christian country in origin, history, tradition, and culture. It was out of Christian doctrine and ethics; I think it can be said that it developed its notion of toleration. No one in this country can be required to have any particular form of religious beliefs and no one can suffer legal discrimination because he has or does not have any particular religious belief but does the fact that we have officially adopted toleration as our standard mean that we must give up our history and our tradition?"

Joseph Story a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, appointed by James Madison has this to say in his "Commentaries on the Constitution" (which was used in our schools as late as the 1900's and is still studied in our law schools). "The first amendment was designed to 'disestablish the state church' to prohibit any State from forcing citizens to pay taxes to support any particular church or sect as was done in so many States at that time; and to prohibit the National Government from favoring any one sect at any time. In his own words 'it was not done to prostrate Christianity but only to exclude all rivalry between the Christian sects.' Also these same men who wrote the Bill of Rights and the first amendment showed their intent very clearly when they also wrote the Ordinance of 1787 which states, 'Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged.' Also the question was asked during that same period: 'How can the religious liberty of a person who has no religion be endangered?' and 'If God is removed from the classroom or the Government what else remains but atheism?'"

As late as 1957, the chief justice of the New York Supreme Court stated "The first amendment of the Constitution does not grant disbelievers preference over believers."

This present Supreme Court evidently feel more deeply for the disbelievers than the believers.

Daniel Webster sums it up so well: "If we and our posterity reject religious instruction and authority, violate the rules of eternal justice, trifle with the injunction of morality and recklessly destroy the political Constitution which holds us together; no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us that shall bring all our glory in profound obscurity."

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

by

LUCILE HOSMER

No one present here was born in as humble circumstances as Abraham Lincoln. Not one whose opportunities in life are as limited as those which surround Lincoln. Yet he became one of our greatest men. His life should prove to all generations that the power of a strong will (tempered by faith in God) and a resolute purpose -- that a man, when he conquers himself (that is, learns self-government) can conquer his own world.

Today every American is rich by comparison to the worldly possessions which Lincoln had during his childhood, his youth and his manhood. Every American is rich beyond comparison to the surroundings of his home and in the comforts of his life -- rich in the opportunities for learning and education. There could not be found today an American youth who is not a millionaire in the possibilities of having vast success in life compared to the possibilities which appeared to be in the grasp of Abraham Lincoln in his youth.

There is one thing which Lincoln did not know and never learned -- and that was fear. He had learned early that man was his own master; that with a strong arm, a strong heart, a strong will and faith in Almighty God there was no power on earth he had to fear. That with his conscience clear and his mind free the future would take care of itself. In this great nation of ours, this Republic, every individual is pledged to do his part for the community in which he lives. Lincoln laid the foundation for his own success when he discovered the power and opportunity which opened through his participation, as an American citizen, in the cause of good government. "Failure is but the closed door to success; try again

and it may open." This was the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln. No matter how many times he had failed, he felt that the possibility for success would be greater the next time he tried.

When he finally became a member of the Legislature, he remained true to himself and his convictions. He took up the cause of freedom of the individual even women -- and created quite a furor by agitating for the emancipation of women from their political slavery. He raised his voice for freedom in a moral protest against slavery and denounced those who arranged their politics in order to gain personal rewards. He had the courage of his convictions, and he lived them.

Abraham Lincoln's mastery of himself -- his self-government -- never allowed his political aspirations to overcome his principles. And while this, for a time, appeared to retard his progress, it ultimately proved to be the stepping stone by which he rose to the fullest height of his ambition.

He believed that slavery was unworthy of the American principle of self-government on which this nation was established and that we must extend liberty and freedom to all, regardless of race, creed and color. It was he who proposed that the Republican party be established, as he put it, "on the rock of the Declaration of Independence, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Our Declaration of Independence states that "man has inalienable rights given to him by his Creator" -- not by government. To put it another way, "God is the author of men's rights -- not government." It also states that "governments are instituted among men to secure these rights", or to defend and protect them, and "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed". In other words, the sovereignty of government is within you and within me, the people, not in the State or Federal government. It is for upholding these rights and these principles that the Republican party is fighting today.

The secret of Abraham Lincoln's success was his simple, honest philosophy, his humor, and his courage to stand firm for the principles in which he believed. Here are some of his words, uttered more than 100 years ago:

"When man governs himself, that is self-government; when he also governs another, that is despotism. For no man is good enough to govern another without that other's consent."

Lincoln was not always serious. He believed that many truths would be illustrated in a humorous way. For example, here is his comment on a fellow lawyer:

"He can compress the most words into the smallest ideas better than any man I ever met."

Like every man who undertakes to follow his conscience at the risk of material ambition, Abraham Lincoln was advised by his friends not to ruin himself and his party -- that not only was he unwise, but a fool to take his stand against slavery. His answer to them was, "I know there is a God and that he hates injustice and slavery. If he has a place and work for me -- and I think he has -- I believe that I am ready. I am nothing, but Truth is everything". With full conviction Lincoln declared, "We have to fight this battle on principle and on principle alone. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it". He continued, "Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menace of destruction to the government; nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might. In that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it".

Once when Lincoln was told by a friend of the description of Lincoln by a very serious and profound historian who doubted that any man of his generation had plunged more deeply into the fount of learning, Lincoln's response was, "or came up drier".

Let us review the ten points which have come to be known as

LINCOLN'S CANNOTMENTS:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build man's character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

The brightness of our American Dream has been badly tarnished by those who worship false gods, such as "security", and look to government, the "State", to take care of them. This is the road that leads inevitably to Socialism and dictatorship. Let us, like Abraham Lincoln, be willing to stand and fight for those principles of freedom that made America great. And let us, each one as individuals, accept the responsibility which is ours to fight for the right of individual liberty, that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth".

*It's free; the government
paid for it.
Is the patriot
an endangered species?
Justice for all...
but more for some.
Who cares about apathy?
Thou shalt not steal...
except to promote the
general welfare.
Just a little loss of liberty.*

Four-page resume 5x7--blue cardboard cover with white lettering; blue interior with black printing. Prepared in 1976 for planned lecture tours,



Do these titles arouse your interest and curiosity? If so, like many Americans you're probably sick of seeing the processes of good government subverted or abandoned in the name of expediency.

If you're tired of hearing the same solution to social problems ("spend more money") proffered by sociologists, journalists, economists, political scientists and politicians, then you'll welcome an articulate, provocative speaker who offers the only workable answer—a return to Constitutional government.

Lucile Hosmer

Now you can hear an authority on Constitutional government speak with wit, perception and knowledge. Not just a theorist or philosopher, Mrs. Hosmer has been active on the American political scene for more than a quarter of a century. She has studied, written and lectured extensively on American history, government and political action. Drawing upon personal experience and from the writings of the founders of the Republic to contemporary authorities, she has spoken to audiences in 37 states. Seven of her talks have been reprinted in the *Congressional Record*.

Fields of Expertise Lucile Hosmer can speak with sensitivity and practical wisdom on all of the following:

The role of government
Political action

The Constitution
The Christian basis of our nation
The Electoral College
Our American heritage

The Supreme Court
Prisons and Prison Reform
Individual responsibility
Women in American History
A different view of the Equal Rights Amendment

How long has it been since you've heard anyone speak with candor on these subjects?

FEDERAL POWER. "Today we have reached the point where there is hardly any individual protection against the power of the federal government which cannot be set aside by it at its own will and discretion as it may determine. In principle, the federal government is now autocratic."

DIVINE LAW. "Today we are told that there is no higher moral law than the whim or will of the majority. This is a denial of the Christian principle that all lawmakers must follow the pattern of divine law."

CRIME. "It is only the criminal on whom the taxpayer's money is being spent. There is no consideration at all given to the victim."

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS. "Our Declaration of Independence states, 'Man has inalienable rights, given to him by his Creator . . . and to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.' That 'government shall be with the consent of the governed.' Today those who wish to maintain this American concept of man's inherent value for which our Founding Fathers fought and died are called reactionary."

SEPARATION OF POWERS. "Separation of powers was intended not to promote efficiency but to prevent any exercise of arbitrary power by any branch of government."

SUPREME COURT. "It was never intended that the Supreme Court should or could substitute interpretation and decree for legislation. It was intended that the sole and whole duty of the Supreme Court was to interpret the law according to the principles set forth in the Constitution itself."

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY. "Unless we accept our responsibility to develop, encourage and cultivate a deeper understanding and appreciation of the true nature of our Constitution, we face the danger of destroying the very fortress that protects our rights and freedoms."

MORALITY. "Where there is no right and no wrong except what is relative, and where no individual is responsible for what he does, no matter how vicious, but can always blame someone else or a set of circumstances — what other result can there be in our society but violence and chaos?"

LIBERTY. "The loss of our liberties, through laws of expediency and the encroachment of the federal government into the minutest detail of the daily life of the individual has come about so stealthily and has been woven thread by tiny thread so silently that the individual citizen is completely unaware of what has happened to his liberties."

BUREAUCRACY. "It can clearly be seen that as bureaucracies grow in size and strength, perpetuating themselves, with no limit on the time they can hold office, with no curb on them by the consent of the governed as to the rules which they pass, and with no real background knowledge of the diversified problems and circumstances in the individual communities, then tyranny and despotism begin to flourish."

ELECTORAL COLLEGE. "Our Electoral College is one of the few remaining structures of our nation which maintains the United States as a Constitutional Republic and prevents us from degenerating into an unlimited Democracy which can be controlled by demagogues."

Impressive Credentials Lucile Hosmer has held over 50 political positions at the county, state and national level. She has been a delegate to three national conventions and an elector to the Electoral College. She has been a member of the California Republican Central Committee since 1948. For several years she wrote a monthly bulletin on legislation which went to 4500 political clubs nationwide. She is listed in *Who's Who in American Politics*. She is a member of the Commonwealth Club of California, and a member of the San Mateo County American Bicentennial Revolution Committee and chairman of the subcommittee of Heritage '76 and the Heritage Faire Committee. She is the State Chapter President, Pro America for Northern California, and State and National Americanism Chairman for Pro America and the Federation of Republican Women. She was the Business and Professional Women's Woman of the Year for 1969. Having been one of the few women in California who have moved from local to national positions, she is currently being interviewed on tape by the Oral History Department of the Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley.

A Love of American History Lucile Hosmer comes by her political interest naturally, since her father served in the California Legislature. This and her mother's love of American history and patriotism set her on the path of active participation in the political process. Her first and greatest love, however, remains our American heritage and its Christian basis.

More than Politics In addition to her political activism, Lucile Hosmer served 1968-1976 as a member of the California Women's Board of Terms and Parole, the California Narcotics Officers Association, and the California Peace Officers Association. Between her parole board duties and speaking engagements, she has written a book on our Republican form of government and the citizen's role within it.

To make arrangements to have this distinguished lecturer on the agenda for your meetings, contact:

Mrs. Merritt R. Hosmer
Box 846
San Carlos, California 94070
(415) 593-4919

Lucille Hosmer

Lucille Hosmer, longtime state Republican Party activist, is dead at the age of 70.

Mrs. Hosmer, who was born in San Francisco, was the widow of former San Carlos Councilman Merritt Hosmer. She lived most of her life in San Mateo County, where she engaged in a variety of political and public service activities.

She was a one-time president of the California Federation of Republican Women and a president of the San Mateo County

unit for four years. Four times she served as a delegate to the GOP's national convention.

Mrs. Hosmer was a member of several other civic organizations, including the Commonwealth Club and Northern California Pro-America.

Memorial services will be held Sunday in San Carlos. Mrs. Hosmer died last Thursday at San Mateo Convalescent Hospital after a long illness.

She is survived by a son, William Hosmer of San Carlos.

Oakland Tribune
March 8, 1978

Lucile C. Hosmer

Memorial services will be held in San Carlos Sunday for Lucile C. Hosmer, prominent for more than 20 years in San Mateo county Republican party activities.

Mrs. Hosmer, who was 70, died last Thursday in San Mateo. Private inurnment has been held at Cypress Lawn Cemetery in Colma.

In 1953, Mrs. Hosmer became the first woman to hold a vice chairmanship of the San Mateo county Republican Central Committee. That same year, she served as chairman of the county Council of Republican Women.

In 1956, she was elected president of the northern division of the California Federation of Republican Women, and in 1961 became chairman of the statewide federation.

She was a member of the San Carlos Villagers, the Commonwealth Club of California, the San Mateo county American Bicentennial Revolution Committee and other patriotic groups.

Mrs. Hosmer also was a member of the state Women's Parole

Board, the state Narcotics Officers Association and the California Peace Officers Association.

She is survived by a son, William Hosmer of Belmont, and a brother, Arnold Callan of Milwaukie, Ore. Her husband, San Carlos insurance man Merritt Hosmer, died in 1969.

Memorial services will be at 3 p.m. Sunday at White Oaks Chapel, 1696 El Camino Real, San Carlos.

Contributions may be made to the American Heritage Christian Gresel avenue and Mission boulevard, Schools, Hayward, 94544.

San Francisco Chronicle
March 7, 1978

JUST FOR TODAY

JUST FOR TODAY — I will know
that I am God's Child under His
protection and, that no plague shall
come nigh my dwelling.

JUST FOR TODAY — I will know
that God is good and that God is Love
and He knoweth them that trust Him.

JUST FOR TODAY — I will know
that I do have strength to meet and
conquer every fear that comes to me
and that under the guidance of God -
Divine Providence - that I will be led
in the right way - and fear will leave
me, too.

JUST FOR TODAY — I will hold to
God's nearness and dearness - I will
know that yesterday is gone and has left
no bitterness nor fear and that today is
big with God's blessings and tomorrow
does belong to God.

He does eliminate fear, anxiety and
worry - and He does give me peace,
happiness and satisfaction, for He has
chosen me as His messenger, so -

JUST FOR TODAY — I will Live,
for to me Life is Christ, to live is joy
and to die is gain.

Lucile Hosmer
1966

IN MEMORIAM

LUCILE CALLAN HOSMER

August 15th, 1907 — March 2nd, 1978

St. John 14: 1 — 3

Daniel 12: 3

A Memorial Service will be held this
Sunday, March 12th, 1978,
at 3:00 p.m., at the

WHITE OAKS CHAPEL
1696 El Camino Real
San Carlos, California 94070

A Memorial Gift may be sent to:

AMERICAN HERITAGE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS
31322 Medinah Street
Hayward, California 94544

They that love *beyond* the World, cannot be
separated by it.

Death cannot kill what *never dies*.

Nor can Spirits ever be *divided*, that love and
live in the same Divine Principle; the Root and
Record of their Friendship.

If Absence be not Death, neither is *theirs*.

Death is but *Crossing* the *World*, as Friends do
the Seas; They live in one *another* still.

For they must need be *present*, that love and live
in that which is *Omnipresent*.

In this Divine Glass, they see Face to Face; and
their Converse is *Free*, as well as *pure*.

This is the Comfort of Friends; that though they
may be said to *die*, yet their Friendship; and
Society are, in the best sense, *ever present*, because
immortal.

WILLIAM PENN, 1693



LUCILE COLLIER HOMER

Born August 15, 1907 - Died March 2, 1978

Following is the text of the remarks delivered
by Mr. James B. Rose during a Memorial Service
held on March 12th, 1978 in San Carlos, California.

I felt Him come to me at night and cool
my fevered brow
And drive out all my pain and fright and tell
me, "Peace be with you, now".

I rose, the new day shining fair, and knew
along the way
That Christ was with me everywhere, His
presence close to stay.

Dear Lord, I place my hand in Thine, as we
walk side by side
Teach me to know that Thou art mine, that
you will always guide.

Help me to listen for Thy word as day
succeeds to day;
Each moment for the warfare, gird to
stand firm in the fray.

Let me avouch myself to Thee, and let
my purpose be
To do Thy will ... as Thou wilt, my Lord
through all eternity.

"I am not a neutral by nature."

So declared Lucile Callan Hosmer in an interview while she was president of the California Federation of Republican women in 1963, 15 years ago.

What then were the essential qualities or attributes of Mrs. Hosmer which impelled her to be neither indifferent nor inactive in the cause of Christian history and civil liberty? Indeed, what identifies the peculiar character and constitution of a people God can use to preserve and perpetuate a Christian Republic today? May I submit for the record a few of the attributes Mrs. Hosmer expressed which may be counted wisdom to embrace and worthy to be remembered and continued by us today.

The Scriptures declare that "without FAITH it is impossible to please Him: for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him". (Heb. 11:6)

Lucile Hosmer's faith in Christ Jesus was steadfast and made her buoyant with hope for herself and for the Republic. She personally 'believed that God IS' as the following unpublished poem entitled "I Felt Him Come to Me", written by her in July 1969, testifies:

Her FAITH was an extension of the historic Faith of Our Fathers, a trust of which she was a conscientious trustee, and a conviction to which she courageously testified in her writing and speaking. In fact, Lucile Hosmer was a pioneer in discovering and articulating the relationship of Biblical Christianity to American civil government. Her love of learning, a heritage of both her parents, and her enthusiasm in declaring the principles and ideas of America's Christian history helped restore to hundreds of citizens -- men and women -- a knowledge of America's Christian history and government. For example, in a speech reprinted in the Congressional Record of March 7, 1960, on "The Nature of Our Constitution", Lucile declared:

THE FREEDOM TRAIL.

For those who walked the "Freedom Trail"
The road was hard and long
They knew their mission must prevail
Else man's hope would be gone.

God gave them strength and grace
To lead men to these shores
They came from every place
With love for Truths of yore.

The "Freedom Trail" from whence they came
Had meant the gallows and the jail
They prayed it would not be the same
That here . . . they would not fail.

They saw what out of Heaven rolled
To listening men here on earth
The liberty of Gold foretold
Through Christ who gave it birth.

Each man who takes this long hard road
Like Paul is shaped by God
He finds the Truth a weighty load
His feet with Love are shod.

They walk along the "Freedom Trail"
And lift their banners high
They know their mission cannot fail
It was not born . . . to die.

Another quality of character Mrs. Hosmer expressed was TENACITY, a capacity and disposition to HOLD FAST what is possessed, a quality which made her stick to her calling in the face of adversity and sometimes scorn.

When she began to claim her heritage of Christian liberty under a Christian form of government and publish it to the men and women involved in California government and national politics, there were many who did not appreciate this emphasis. Many scoffed and scorned her witness to the

"Jesus said that He had come "to fulfill the law". Christianity includes the Ten Commandments plus the grace and truth and compassion of the teachings of Christ. His command "Love thy neighbor as thyself" as well as the Beatitudes were all accepted by our Founding Fathers as the moral law upon which should be established our Constitutional Republic.

"The First Commandment was accepted as the truth of the sanctity of the individual under God; and that no man or State had the right to enslave or rule him in any way which would force him to deny the supremacy of God . . ."

Just for the record, the phrase "America's Christian History", an idea which Lucile pioneered in promulgating to Californians, is defined by Miss Verna Hall in her profound volume called "The Christian History of the American Revolution -- Consider and Ponder" as "... based upon the conviction that America's civil freedom, i.e., freedom for the individual, came from God through His Son, Jesus Christ, and is the result or effect of Christianity's development and westward march from Asia through Europe and England to America." (Consider and Ponder, p. xxiv, Col. 1)

This was Lucile Hosmer's conviction and she boldly documented both the spirit and letter of this precious story in poems, speeches and political action programs.

Mrs. Hosmer always enjoyed poetry and expressed her affection for America's heritage of Christian character by writing poems for her friends on 4th of July celebrations. The following excerpts from one of her poems is a memorial to her sweet conviction of the relation between faith and freedom:

Providence of God in America, but she kept on telling the story "like it is", surely praying with the Apostle Paul, "And now, Lord, behold their threatenings, and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word." (Acts 4:29) Whereas many of her friends and foes in politics would count on her political wisdom and acumen to promote the cause of Republican Party politics, and depend upon her marvelous ability to organize the grass roots for proper political activities, they would tend to disdain the source and origin of her spirit and energy -- Christ and the Bible -- but she, like the Apostle Paul, would continue to "HOLD FAST" the profession of [her] faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;) " (Heb. 10:23)

Ladies and gentlemen, Mrs. Hosmer persevered in local, state and national political conflicts; she suffered much from those who were indifferent or who disdained her labor and sentiments; she endured a host of grievous disappointments and hopes deferred or blasted, but she KEPT ON KEEPING ON for both your good and my happiness as Americans and as Christians. She fought to retain what God had entrusted to her and to us -- a nation with a form of government in its original spirit and purpose which secured to the individual the greatest expression of individual liberty, self-government and property the world has ever known. Don't you think she would have us claim today the revelation of Jesus Christ to St. John in Revelation 2:25-29 that "that which ye have already HOLD FAST till I come. And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers; even as I received of my Father. And I will give him the morning star. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."

You remember Mrs. Hosmer's declaration that "I am not a neutral by nature". I trust no one here will be neutral either to the love she had for you, her friends, or the love she had for America's Christian history. I trust no American will be indifferent, or afraid to take an active part in contending either for the Faith of Our Fathers, or for America's Gospel purpose. Lucile Hosmer's nature or peculiar character was to not separate her love for God from her love for America, and in her memory I would commend to you that we too be faithful to God and our country today and STAND FAST having this rainbow of promise, that

God is working His purpose out,
His Truth is marching on!

The service was closed with the soloist singing
"The Battle Hymn of the Republic"
(by Julia Ward Howe, Washington, D. C. 1861)

IN MEMORIAM TO LUCILE HOSMER

We have lost in the recent death of Lucile Hosmer one of our great soldiers in the fight for the preservation of our country as a free and independent republic under God.

Lucile Hosmer's life was a working embodiment of the Creed, principles and objectives of Pro America. She came by her interest in good government naturally, carrying on the tradition of her father, Edwin Joseph Callen, a prominent member of the California legislature early in the century. She devoted a lifetime of service to her county, state and the nation she loved.

She gained national recognition as a Republican leader, author and lecturer. For years she wrote a monthly bulletin that went nationally to 4,500 clubs and her legislative recommendations became influential in the political scene. She had been president of the California Federation of Republican Women and had been four times a delegate to the Republican National Conventions. She was elected six times to the San Mateo County Republican Central Committee. She was a member of the executive committee of the State Central Committee.

Seven of her talks were reprinted in the Congressional Record, including one on the importance of keeping the Electoral College as necessary to preserve our representative form of government. As long ago as 1959 and the 60's she was giving her talk of the demoralizing dangers of inflation, as witness the parallel between the decline of Rome and the path being taken by the U.S. government.

The California State Legislature a year ago awarded her a gold medal for her heritage work in the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, particularly for the widely published work she had prepared on the "Farmers Letters" and the "Monitors Letters," vital pre-Revolutionary documents published first locally and later widely.

At the same time she was chairing the heritage program and the Heritage Faire visited by tens of thousands in San Mateo in 1976, she was serving as Pro America Chapter president for Northern California and also completing her term as a member of the California Women's Board of Terms and Parole, an arduous and depressing job. She was also being interviewed intermittently by the Oral History Department of the Bancroft Library of the University of California for a series on her knowledge of political work women of California have done at all levels. She was also appearing on television, at various meetings and conventions and hearings as a speaker opposing the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

She was a fearless, tireless champion for the American heritage of constitutional government based on Christian principles. Her battles for these principles were wide ranged, from opposition to removing prayer from the schools to battling attempts by some to eliminate public observance of Christmas. Her complaint to the Editor resulted in the attached interview a masterfully expressed piece of scholarship that makes it perfectly clear that there is no basis for an attack of the celebration of Christmas, a holiday related to our heritage and background.

Dear to her heart was the education of audiences on the Christian foundation underlying the constitution, stressing that in this document the people were acknowledging God as their sovereign, and were reserving for themselves sovereignty over the State. For the first time in history government was to be the servant, and not the master of the people. She quickly and constantly pointed out that the erosion of our freedoms continue as long as voters spurn self government in favor of forfeiting all powers to big brother government to take care of them.

She earned her rest, but we shall surely miss her. Her friend, Peggy Moore

INDEX -- Lucile Hosmer

Ahmanson, Howard, 93-94, 98
 Alexander, Annette, 41, 57
 Almack, John Conrad, 38
 American Conservative Union (ACU), 148-149
 Ashcraft, Juanita (Nita), 164-165
 Athearn, Mrs. Forden, 66

Baker, Howard, 154
 Benedict, Marjorie, 45, 75, 103, 127-131
 Bliss, Ray, 153
 Bowler, Ann, 104-105
 Brock, Margaret, 152
 Brown, Catherine Kennedy, 103
 Buckley, James, 149
 Burns, William, 11

Caldecott, Thomas W., 39, 98
 California, and Civil War, 12-13
 California Republican Assembly (CRA), 39-40, 123-124
 Callan, Edwin Joseph, 4-6, 7-14, 23
 California State Assemblyman (1909-1911), 9-13
 Callan, Lucy Helm, 2-8, 14-22, 24
 Callan, Victor Arnold, 9, 14, 17
 Carter, Jimmy, 141, 153
 Cereghino, Mary, 38-39, 45, 58
 Chotiner, Murray, 94
 Connich, Patricia, 99
 crossfiling, 71-72
 Curb, Mike, 131-132, 144, 152

DeLap, Tony, 56
 Dinkelspiel, Clara, 60, 83
 Dinkelspiel, John, 60, 83-84
 Doe, Florence, 99
 Dole, Robert, 154
 Dolwig, Richard, 46-48, 52, 71
 Dunn, Isabella, 147

Eagle Forum, 147-149
 election campaigns, local (California)
 (1946) Sequoia Union High School District Board Elections, 36-39

election campaigns (California)
 (1950) senatorial, 54-55
 (1958) gubernatorial, 102, 111-122
 election campaigns (national)
 (1948) presidential, 51-52
 (1952) presidential, 69-71
 (1960) presidential, 163
 (1964) presidential, 143, 152
 election reforms, crossfiling, 71-72
 Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), 145-146
 Evans, Stanton, 149

Federation of Republican Women (California)
 Northern California Division, structure, 75-93, 97-111
 pre-primary endorsements, prohibition, 62-64
 San Mateo County clubs, 41-46, 49-51, 57-64
 Federation of Republican Women (national), 110-111
 Ferre, Jackie, 77
 Ford, Betty, 150-151
 Ford, Gerald, 136-137, 153-154, 157
 Forker, Ysabel, 99-100
 Fuller, Jean Wood, 79, 104

Glasstone, Samuel, 34-35

Haerle, Paul, 164-166
 Hale, Marshall, Sr., 12
 Halley, James W., 46, 123
 Hayakawa, Samuel, 164
 Helms, Jesse, 149
 Hillings, Pat, 94
 Hitt, Patricia, 104, 128-130, 133
 Hosmer, Lucile Callan
 education, grammar school, 14-17; high school, 24-26, college, 26-27
 employment, Hale's Department Store, 28
 family, parents' background, 1-14; marriages, (first marriage) 27-28,
 (Merritt Hosmer) 28-30, 32-35, 40, 47, 81, 85, 107-109, 133
 political activity, San Mateo County election campaigns, 38-39; California
 Republican Assembly, 39-40; Federation of Republican Women, 41-46, 57-64,
 106-111, 127; San Mateo County Republican Central Committee, 45, 47-48;
 Republican State Central Committee, 53; Republican national conventions,
 125-163; Pro America, 72-73, 101
 retirement, 161-162
 Hosmer, Merritt, 28-35, 65, 67, 70, 81, 85, 107-109, 114
 Sequoia Union High School Board, 36-39

Hosmer, William, 22, 29, 30, 107-109

Ingersoll, Frank, 46, 67

Johnson, Gardiner, 134-135

Kahn, Julius and Florence Prag, 12

Kamp, Joseph, 115-116

Kenyon, Cecil, 80, 101-102, 105, 117, 120

Knight, Goodwin, 84, 93-94, 115

Knowland, Helen, 112-113, 115, 122

Knowland, William, 102-103, 111-123, 129, 134

La Mesa Redonda Club, San Francisco, 17-21

Larsen, Frances, 100

Laxalt, Paul, 143

League of Women Voters, 43

McQueen, George, 69

Martin, Joseph, 128, 135

Miner, Harry C., 56, 73

Mitchell, Bruce, 152

Montgomery, Michael, 166

Myhrs, Ardis, 58-59, 78, 106

Nixon, Patricia Ryan, 55, 160-161

Nixon, Richard M., 54-55, 126, 160

Nofziger, Franklin (Lyn), 144

O'Donnell, Gladys, 79, 98, 110-111, 116-117, 120, 129, 130

Orr, Jean, 58

Penland, Gladys L., 73, 78-80, 101, 106

Prince, Mildred, 71-72

Pro America, 72-73, 97, 99

Rapsey, Rudolph A., 48

Reagan, Nancy, 150-151, 157-159

Reagan, Ronald, 91

at 1976 Republican national convention, 136-137, 144, 152, 156-158

- Republican Associates, 123-124
- Republican party (California)
 - and pre-primary endorsements, 63-64
 - San Mateo County, 47-49, 67-68, 73-75
 - state central committee, 44-45, 53, 93-97
 - See also Federation of Republican Women (California)
- Republican party (national)
 - (1960) convention, 125-129, 159-160
 - (1964) convention, 135, 137
 - (1976) convention, 136-158
 - 16C rules fight, 139-143, 145-146
 - platform, 145-146, 150
- Rice, Virginia, 131-132
- Richardson, Enoch, 48, 51, 54-55, 64, 67-68
- Ring, Eleanor, 105-106, 147, 152
- Rockefeller, David, 141
- Rockefeller, Nelson, 140
- Roothe, Hilde, 58

- Sagehorn, Al, 64-67
- Sandstrom, Elsa, 105, 110, 131-132, 134, 144, vi-vii
- San Mateo County, California
 - politics, 64-69
 - See also Republican party (California)
- Schlaflly, Phyllis, 110-111, 129, 147, 150
- Sears, John, 143
- Sequoia Union High School District, (1946) elections, 36-39
- Shattuck, Edward, 39
- Shirpser, Clara, 59-60
- Stanford University, Department of Education experimental school, 37-38
- Stearns, Myrtle Clark, 49-51
- Steinegger, Henriette, 110-111
- Stidham, Barbara, 63

- Thielle, Raymonde, 106, 110-111

- United Republicans of California (UROC), 63

- von Riddlestein, Maria, 28

- Warren, Earl, 67-71
- Waters, Laughlin, 73
- Watson, Ruth, 90-91

Werdel, Thomas, 69-70
women's clubs, San Francisco
 La Mesa Redonda, 17-21
 San Francisco Breakfast Women's Club, 49

Youngduff, Naomi, 82-83
Younger, Evelle, 152
Younger, J. Arthur, 64-68
Younger, Mildred, 100

Zimmerman, Jane, 98-99, 103

Malca Chall

Graduated from Reed College in 1942 with a B.A. degree, and from the State University of Iowa in 1943 with an M.A. degree in Political Science.

Wage Rate Analyst with the Twelfth Regional War Labor Board, 1943-1945, specializing in agriculture and services. Research and writing in the New York public relations firm of Edward L. Bernays, 1946-1947, and research and statistics for the Oakland Area Community Chest and Council of Social Agencies 1948-1951.

Active in community affairs as a director and past president of the League of Women Voters of the Hayward Area specializing in state and local government; on county-wide committees in the field of mental health; on election campaign committees for school tax and bond measures, and candidates for school board and state legislature.

Employed in 1967 by the Regional Oral History Office interviewing in fields of agriculture and water resources. Project director, Suffragists Project, California Women Political Leaders Project, and Land-Use Planning Project.

118370

